DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 194 SO 013 354

AUTHOR	Presseisen, Barbara Z., Ed.
TITLE	School Governance and Classroom Climate: Concerns of Theory and Practice in Citizen Education.
INSTITUTION	Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	13 May 81
NOTE	207p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship Education: *Classroom Environment: Democratic Values: Educational Administration: *Educational Practices: Educational Psychology: Educational Sociology: *Educational Theories: Elementary Secondary Education: *Governance: Political Socialization: School Policy: State of the Art Reviews

ABSTRACT

Citizenship education is examined by 17 authors in this edited volume. Most of the papers were originally prepared for a 1979 colloquium on behavior variables relating to citizen education, particularly school governance and classroom climate. Articles are presented in two major sections. In section one, the three papers are entitled, "Socialization Perspectives for School Governance and Classroom Climates," "The Rights of Children: Challenges in Today's World," and "The School Environment and Citizen Education." In section two, "Implications for Citizen Education", 12 articles present reflections on and responses to articles in section one, information on political education research, data regarding educational implications of various child development models, a discussion of the relation of psychological and sociological research to education, and recommendations regarding what practitioners and researchers can do in the immediate future to improve citizen education. Recommendations, included in a paper entitled "Seeking Recommendations for Practice: A Conclusion," suggest that citizen education should be supported by the whole range of educational professionals, can be encouraged by providing students with a group identity within the school, should transcend a narrow social studies approach, should concentrate on developing skills and knowledge for effective citizenship, and should foster the awareness that concepts such as justice and equality should be based on a concern for everyone's welfare. The document concludes with brief biographical sketches of contributors and a selected bibliography. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED204194

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marian L. Chapman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

School Governance and Classroom Climate:

Concerns of Theory and Practice in Citizen Education

Barbara Z. Presseisen
Editor

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

SO 013 354

A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder.

- John Dewey
Democracy and Education
1916

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ON CITIZEN EDUCATION: A PREFACE vii

THREE PERSPECTIVES OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND CLASSROOM CLIMATE

1. SOCIALIZATION PERSPECTIVES FOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND CLASSROOM CLIMATES
Judith Gillespie and Mary Soley 3

2. THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN: CHALLENGES IN TODAY'S WORLD
David Elkind 35

3. THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND CITIZEN EDUCATION
Paul V. Gump 57

IMPLICATIONS FOR CITIZEN EDUCATION

4. COMMENTARIES ON POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION
Introduction to Commentaries on Political Socialization
Joseph J. D'Amico 89

REFLECTIONS ON SOCIALIZATION PERSPECTIVES FOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND CLASSROOM CLIMATE
Murry Nelson 93

RESPONSE TO SOCIALIZATION PERSPECTIVES FOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND CLASSROOM CLIMATES
Nancy B. Wyner 101

POLITICAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION
Lee H. Ehman 109

5. COMMENTARIES ON HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT
Introduction to Commentaries on Human Growth and Development
Nicholas M. Sanders 125

RESPONSE TO THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN: CHALLENGES IN TODAY'S WORLD
George W. French 127

PIAGET'S GROWTH MODEL VERSUS A DEFICIT MODEL: EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PREADOLESCENT
Jeanette McCarthy Gallagher 135

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

6. COMMENTARIES ON INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENTS
Introduction to Commentaries on Institutional Environments
Barbara Z. Presseisen 145

PSYCHOLOGICAL SYNOMORPHS AND SOCIOLOGICAL STRUCTURES
Joyce L. Epstein 149

CRITIQUE AND RESPONSE TO THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND CITIZEN EDUCATION
Jean Dresden Grambs 157

CONFLICT NEGOTIATION AND CITIZEN EDUCATION
John P. DeCecco and Petra Liljestrand 169

7. SEEKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE: A CONCLUSION
Barbara Z. Presseisen 193

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF CONTRIBUTORS 201

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 207

5

ON CITIZEN EDUCATION: A PREFACE

The field of citizen education has grown rapidly over the past decade. The Council of Chief State School Officers proposed effective citizen education as a basic goal of American education in 1976, and many articles and studies have considered the meanings and implications of new programs in civic learning. By and large, a different focus characterizes the recent emphasis on citizen education. Whereas patriotism, knowledge of facts and information about U. S. government, and limited views of American history dominated the teaching of the past, the new focus stresses more dynamic decision making, knowledge about social change both individual and institutional, and concern for the values and events of America's historical past.

> . . . in a society with democratic ideas, such as ours, there ought to be more to education for responsible citizenship than passive acceptance of duly constituted authority. In a society with democratic ideas, responsible citizenship entails both obedience and constructive skepticism. It involves both respect for authority and citizens who are both compliant and independent, who will demonstrate obedience to the law while retaining a spirit of constructive criticism and reasonable dissent. (J. Patrick in Looking At, ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, 1977, p. 1.)

The new citizen education recognizes that the preparation of young citizens relies on more than the classroom and the individual teacher. The home and the community are important influences in shaping the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that comprise responsible and effective citizenship. Institutions such as the school system and the courts also have significant roles in imparting knowledge and expectations about citizen behavior. Professional educators and researchers provide theoretical frameworks within which programs of instruction are put into practice across the nation.

This volume focuses on the particular concerns of citizen education in the areas of school governance and classroom climate. These are largely holistic, process concerns. Two questions underlie the particular focus. How does the way in which a school is managed influence the concepts of authority, responsibility, rights, and freedoms as they are included in students' citizen education preparation? How does a classroom's organization or the design of the school's environment influence the perception of the "climate" of that institution and its citizen education program?

To answer these questions, Research for Better Schools (RBS) conducted several activities that gave scholars and practitioners opportunities to meet and discuss their common concerns. An RBS colloquium on behavior variables related to citizen education was held in Philadelphia on May 11-12, 1978 and involved national scholars and educators. An Executive Academy, presented under the sponsorship of the Pennsylvania Department of Education, was held February 5-8, 1979, and included educators from across the state. A two-day colloquium for school personnel from the tri-state (Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania) region was held in Philadelphia on May 29, 1979, and provided opportunities for specialists from three research areas to consider the specific citizen education concerns of school governance and classroom climate. The papers of that colloquium are the major portion of this volume. The research areas examined include political socialization, human growth and development, and institutional environment. One of the main goals of the May colloquium was to become aware of the contribution of these research areas to an understanding of school governance and classroom climate.

Political socialization is a research area long concerned with school governance issues. The area has developed an extensive literature and political socialization specialists have sought empirical evidence about at least four student outcomes closely related to citizen education: political knowledge, political attitudes and values toward society and politics, attitudes toward political participation, and participation in political or quasi-political affairs. As researchers in political socialization, Judith Gillespie and Mary Soley addressed RBS' May colloquium.

Human growth and development is a research area closely associated with child psychology and social development. Whether child-centered or learner oriented, the characteristics of the maturing citizen, through childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood, are concerns for the ways schools are governed and classrooms managed. Specialists in this area have recently begun to explore children's conceptions of community and government and to suggest stages of societal understanding. David Elkind addressed the May colloquium and discussed a topic on human growth and development.

Institutional environment is a research area which only recently has begun to be addressed by educational scholars and practitioners. Their focus has largely been to study causal effects, to explore why and how certain settings or institutions seem to create more conducive atmospheres for learning. To some extent, research in this area to date has only unearthed new issues and uncovered further unresolved questions. Nevertheless, the work of these research specialists may prove to be highly significant to understanding the variables on which decisions about schooling policies are made. Paul Gump addressed the May colloquium and discussed a topic on institutional environment.

The May colloquium sought to achieve two other goals in addition to building an awareness of the three research areas as related to governance, classroom climate, and issues of citizen education. First, the colloquium sought to bridge the communication gap that exists between theory and practice in educational research. University scholars infrequently have the opportunity to exchange ideas with policy makers and curriculum planners actively engaged in the schools. Each major area paper was thus critiqued by both a theorist or researcher and an educational practitioner. Second, the colloquium sought to facilitate discussion by academicians and school personnel on what suggestions they have for improving citizen education by actual practices of governance and changes in instructional environment. State agency, district, and local school staff persons were encouraged to share their perspectives of the problems of governance and classroom management in discussion groups of colloquium participants. Summaries of the discussions among participants have been included in the conclusion of this volume.

In addition to the papers of the May colloquium, a paper by Lee H. Ehman on political socialization research originally presented at the RBS Pennsylvania Executive Academy has been included in this volume. Similarly, John DeCecco and Petra Liljestrand completed a paper on the resolution of school conflict for the RBS colloquium on behavior variables, and that paper has also been included in this collection. Both of these studies contribute to the central topics of concern and complement many points made by the colloquium authors.

The first three chapters of the volume present the major papers of the three research area scholars. The three subsequent chapters contain commentaries by other scholars and practitioners on each of the research area presentations. The final chapter highlights major themes of school governance and classroom climate and lists suggestions regarding actual practices for citizen education made at the May colloquium. Extensive bibliographic citations are made throughout the volume and a comprehensive reference list can be found at the end of the document.

Barbara Z. Presseisen
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
1980

1

SOCIALIZATION PERSPECTIVES FOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND CLASSROOM CLIMATES

Judith Gillespie and Mary Solev
Program in Educational Policy and Change
Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis
Indiana University, Bloomington

The topic of school governance and classroom climates is a complex one, both theoretically and practically. It can be approached in a variety of ways. A tripartite division of the study of school governance and classroom climates into organizational, human development, and socialization perspectives reveals a great deal of variation. In addition, differences within a particular perspective may be as significant as those across them.

Within the socialization field, researchers have used various approaches in their study of school governance and classroom climate. Some have used a developmental approach. Here stages of cognitive and affective development have been studied directly, and student growth has become the focus of the study of school governance and classroom climates. Questions such as how students acquire knowledge, skills and attitudes become the chief questions for study. Normally, the learning environment, rather than the social and/or political structure of schools and classrooms, is of primary concern.

Other researchers have looked at agents of socialization, including parents, teachers, media heroes and heroines, and political figures such as the President. In essence, this approach indicates that people or institutions impact on student attitudes and behaviors.

A third way of looking at the topic involves the study of socialization processes using a democratic systems approach. Here researchers have been concerned with questions of loyalty and support, or integration of the citizen into the larger political system. Under this approach, the chief area of study is the role of educational governance in general citizenship training.

The particular socialization perspective one takes does make a difference. Let us consider, for example, the socialization of a typical middle school student. We will look at Susie, a seventh grader, first from a developmental perspective. This perspective would focus our attention on Susie's particular potential for cognitive growth, and her affective capabilities. It would recognize a major developmental potential at this age level as well as the problems associated with Susie's transition into puberty and her peer group orientation.

Yet we could take a different approach to understanding Susie. Using the agent of socialization approach, we would look at Susie's parents, her teachers, the heroes and heroines she comes in contact with in the media, and her relationship to major figures in the society. We would look at the influence of each of these agents and see what impact they have on Susie. We would try to encourage change in the agents operating in Susie's life, rather than focus directly on Susie's development.

Finally, we could approach the study of Susie as a citizen. Here we would focus on Susie's role in the larger society: how (and whether) she will vote, what groups she will join, what contributions she will make to her work place or community.

None of these approaches is used exclusively by any group of researchers or practitioners, yet how the three are combined makes a real difference. In this paper we will outline a variety of perspectives from the socialization field and sketch the implications of these perspectives for school governance and classroom climates. We will examine the answers they give to important governance questions. In addition, we will consider what answers are not provided by the perspectives and what new questions are raised. We will propose an ecological approach as a way of integrating the salient features of a variety of socialization perspectives. Finally, we will provide some suggestions for improving the study of school and classroom governance.

Socialization Perspectives

It is probably important to begin with a definition of socialization. Most people view socialization as a process through which values and habits are acquired. Formal and informal learning experiences serve to teach us those attitudes, values and behaviors which then become incorporated into our life-styles. The socialization process is a dynamic one of growth and development. It includes the growth of individuals, the process through which societal institutions influence individuals, and the impact of a broad range of global interaction patterns.

There are probably over a dozen perspectives on the socialization process. As stated earlier, three will be described in this paper: the developmental approach, the socialization agents approach, and the democratic systems approach. Major concepts within each perspective will be discussed along with the findings and implications for school governance and classroom climates.

Developmental Approach

A variety of research efforts, including those of Piaget (Ginsburg & Opper, 1969) and Kohlberg (1971) fall into this category. From an educational perspective, the developmental approach focuses on growth patterns of youth and the processes through which children develop their cognitive, affective and participatory potential.

There are several major concepts which characterize a developmental approach. These include cognitive growth, affective growth, stages of growth, and identity. A great deal of research has been done surrounding each of the major concepts, making contributions to the understanding of child development.

Cognitive growth reflects the intellectual development of youth, generally through schooling. Research by Piaget, Bloom (1956) and others shows distinct stages of cognitive growth which begin with a recall relationship to knowledge, and extend through the capability to deal with evaluative principles. Findings from this research have demonstrated that students' cognitive behaviors can be molded and changed through the schooling process. Both classrooms and schools can affect the cognitive growth of children measurably.

Other research has shown that the informal environment in schools, in addition to the formal curriculum, influences the cognitive development of students. Students who participate more are key figures in sports activities or school councils and tend to get better grades and to demonstrate more cognitive growth. Thus, the general school environment--the classroom, the extracurricular activities and the curriculum--influences cognitive development (Newmann, 1970). Socialization theorists have been particularly interested in the ways in which cognitive potential develops and produces inquiring, thinking students. For example, Bruner's (1960) research states that the process of thinking grows over time as the variety of instructional techniques and opportunities within the school environment are accessible to students.

The second major concept within the developmental approach is affective growth. Here the moral and emotional development of students are of primary concern. The acquisition of values, attitudes and beliefs are part of the developmental process. Kohlberg (1971) and others have developed theories of how youth acquire values and attitudes. They believe that students' capacity for moral reasoning can be expanded through experience with valuing situations known as moral dilemmas.

Research in this area arose out of a need to integrate affective growth and development into the curriculum. During the 1960s, curriculum projects placed a great emphasis on cognitive skills. Educators have begun to recognize the need and potential for affective growth through classroom and school governance patterns. Currently, several projects are operating which stress the acquisition of valuing skills and their applications.

The third concept under the developmental approach is the stage theory of growth. This is most often seen as a linear process, although current research is indicating its interactive or cyclical nature. Researchers who study both cognitive and affective processes attempt to plot stages through which students move and factors which encourage or inhibit cognitive and affective development. Within this framework, learning activities and environments are constructed to facilitate movement to higher stages.

The final major concept involves identity. In Erikson's (1968) terms, the concept of identity includes the self, the learning process, and identification with and through others. Here, the developmental approach focuses on the individual in a variety of dimensions in the development of a coherent personality and a set of role behaviors. Identity can be studied in personal or interactional terms. In the latter case, the school becomes an important environment for the creation of a positive self-image. Organizational structures and learning experiences are created in order to foster individual identity.

These concepts contain several implications for school governance and classroom climate. Certainly, people who follow the developmental approach will focus on students as individuals within schools. Governance will be determined in order to influence students' developmental patterns. Rules which regulate and those which offer opportunities will be designed to enhance the potential for student development.

Socialization Agents Approach

The second perspective on the socialization process is the agents approach. Its focus is on people and institutions and is primarily concerned with the socialization agents in the educational, economic, and political sectors. The classic research by Hess and Torney (1967) reflects the influences that individuals and groups can have on students' attitudes and behaviors. They infer from their data, for example, that the school is the most influential political socialization agent with respect to attitudes about good citizenship, compliance with rules and authorities, attachment to symbols and institutions, and independence from partisan politics.

The major concepts within this approach are: institutions, roles, and the relationships between agents and those who are being socialized. How the school operates as a total institution is of concern. The school serves many functions that influence students. The level of bureaucracy, the systems of control, and the flexibility of the environment are all studied.

Institutional organization and the role each institution plays are of primary interest. Findings demonstrate that a wide variety of institutional agents are interactive--the home, the school, the media, and community organizations (Remy, 1977). This approach definitely widens the range of factors that affect and control students. It requires the definition of a role for education within a complex set of institutions. In the past, this role has not been well-defined, and schools have assumed a wide variety of responsibilities in the socialization process.

Research findings have been contradictory regarding the school's influence on students' attitudes and behaviors. It is apparently one of a set of socialization influences. Yet the school's particular power and impact are as yet ill-defined. Langton and Jennings (1968), for example, found that the civics and government curriculum had little or no impact on political attitudes of students, except in the case of their black subsample. Ehman (1972), however, found a positive relationship between social studies courses and political efficacy and no differential racial effects. Identifying the "hidden" curriculum of the institution adds another agent of socialization. Very few studies, however, have focused on multiple agents or discriminated among the influences that different institutions might have.

Another major concept in the socialization approach involves the role that individuals take in interacting with students. Here researchers have been concerned with the roles modeled by parents, teachers, media heroes and heroines, and political figures such as the President. How these roles are taken by adult agents and how students are socialized as a result is a major focus for study. Again, research results are confused. It is not clear what particular influences are distinguishable across, for example, both teachers and parents, although it is clear that they are both important role models for student development.

A final concept in this approach focuses on the relationship between agents and those who are being socialized. Researchers are interested in interaction patterns between parents and children, as well as between teachers and students. Research along these lines focuses on interaction patterns in the classroom as well as those among students, teachers, and administrators within school settings. Findings reflect that both the quantity and the quality of interactions can impact dramatically on students' attitudes and behaviors (Ehman, 1969).

Implications of the socialization agents approach for school governance and classroom climates are many. Those studying schools through this approach would first look at those in charge and study them in terms of their impact on students. The study of the principal, for example, and his or her relationship to teachers and students would be a good example of this approach to socialization.

The approach would also imply a focus on rules within the school system. The total school environment, as well as classroom regulations, would be examined. As rule-making agents, administrators and teachers would be a primary focus. The effect of rules on interaction patterns between these agents and students would be a major area for study.

The approach would also call for widening the concept of education and its potential impact to a variety of agents who share responsibility for students' schooling. There is a current move to broaden the study of educational interactions to include the community, the home, the workplace, and even the mass media. All relevant socialization agents and their interaction with students are open to investigation. For example, Chaffee (1977) summarized the research to date relating mass communication to political behavior. One conclusion states that the mass media constitute the principal source of political information for young people. Children who pay close attention to news in the media are also more likely to discuss public affairs in the home. Clearly, mass communication is an important factor that must be taken into account in conceptualizing any system of political education.

A final implication of this approach to school governance and classrooms involves focusing on agents of socialization as initiators of change. Agents are concerned about their impact on students and would change their own behavior in order to change students' behavior. Much of school reform has focused on changing the agents of socialization rather than trying other means to make an impact on students' attitudes and behaviors.

Democratic Systems Approach

The last approach to be discussed is the democratic systems approach. It deals with the interaction of school and society, and participation within the school system. Here the school is seen as a practice arena for socializing students to assume adult roles in the democratic processes of the larger society. Studies done by Easton and Dennis (1969) reflect this particular approach. The roles students play in school and society become a primary concern.

The major concepts in this approach are attitudes of support for the democratic system, participation, representation and change. A recurrent theme in a democratic theory is whether or not support for democratic norms exists within society. Normative as well as descriptive theories reflect this concern. Many researchers have attempted to determine which socialization processes help facilitate support for democratic norms. Findings reflect that a school's democratization may or may not result in supportive attitudes on the part of students. Curricula designed to increase support for democratic principles have not proven to increase adherence (Ehman, 1977). While support is generally found in the abstract, little consensus exists in the application of democratic principles in specific situations.

The second major concept involves participation. Those interested in a democratic systems approach focus on a controversy that has been wide-ranging over the last decade. This controversy involves the extent and form of participation that is necessary for citizens to support the democratic system. Some argue that participation is not necessary on the part of all citizens as long as segments of the public are informed and vigilant (Dahl, 1956). On the other hand, others argue that some forms of participation are necessary on the part of all citizens in order to maintain the democratic way of life (Pateman, 1970). This concept involves looking at schools in terms of their socialization of students for democratic participation both inside the classroom and in general school governance. In this situation, student participation in school governance and classroom organization is considered to be an important part of socialization training.

It is worth noting here that participation has most often been considered by researchers as a one-way process. For example, administrators may "allow" students to participate in student councils. In effect, they control the boundaries under which students participate. Researchers are beginning to explore more reciprocal relationships and their impact under the rubric of the idea of "co-production." Co-production involves joint planning, decision-making, and implementation efforts. It is to be hoped that some comparative work will soon begin on the differential impact of these two approaches on student citizenship activities.

Representation is another key concept involved in this approach. Here there is a basic concern for students' rights and responsibilities within the school and general political system. How students are represented becomes a major focus for study. Researchers are recognizing the importance of students' rights and how representation impacts students' direct participation in school governance.

A final major concept within this approach involves change. Here researchers and practitioners have focused on the need for citizens to participate in changes in the system in both formal and informal ways. Changes within the school classroom which are student initiated become a major focus of attention. The impact of such activity on students' attitudes and behaviors is included.

The implications for utilizing the democratic systems approach for understanding school governance and classroom climates are several. On the one hand, governance questions focus on the society and the need for support of general societal norms through attitudes and participation. On the other hand, specific kinds of citizen participation and training become an important focus. Both the micro- and macro-socialization aspects of democratic systems would be at the heart of any study that included a democratic systems approach.

A democratic systems approach also tends to focus on preparation for the future. In this sense, both school governance and classroom environment prepare future citizens for participation in the democratic system. They would be concerned about the future shape of the democratic system and how citizen participation would impact upon it.

Governance would also be viewed in terms of participation. Here the entire question of who governs or which citizens govern is a major case in point. Implications for school governance would include raising questions as to appropriate participation and representation in school policy as well as in classroom decision-making.

The approach also raises a major issue of control and how leader-follower relationships are conducted in a democratic system. How much control and for what purposes is an essential question here. The socialization process which builds support may or may not be one which results from control of or by a given set of people.

All these different approaches have a great deal to say about how schools, administrators and teachers treat students. In the first instance, the developmental approach, students are the subject of governance questions. Their developmental needs are of primary concern. In the second approach, socialization agents are concerned with their own behaviors and relationship to students. In the democratic systems approach, students are part of a group that extends beyond the school and their preparation focuses on larger societal purposes. In each case, Susie will be treated differently within the school system and within the classroom and will be prepared for different types of roles within society.

The implications for research are great, as are those for practice. When the whole question of school change is raised, the issues of who governs that change and who reforms whom are major ones. Whether these issues are administration, curricular or community related, the extent to which education is a collaborative process, concerned with both students and professional educators, is influenced dramatically by the type of approach employed.

Issues in School and Classroom Governance

We all know that a large part of problem solving depends on the perspective that is taken by those involved in the process. Often, basic value assumptions and structural questions remain hidden from view. We have seen that there are real differences in socialization approaches and in their implications for school and classroom governance. Our purpose here is to demonstrate how generic governance issues can be handled differentially depending on the approach that is used, and to propose an integrated, ecological approach to problem solving.

Roles of the School

One prominent issue in school and classroom governance is the role of the school in student learning. As societies have become more complex, the school has taken on new responsibilities. Academic and vocational preparation, social training and the preparation of citizens, and the teaching of humanistic values have all become part of the school's role.

The variety of purposes and goals for the school poses a governance problem. How schools state purposes and goals can be influenced dramatically by the perspective that is taken. Suppose, for example, that school administrators or teachers decide to provide quality education. Their perception of what is quality education could vary depending upon the particular socialization approach that they used. Using a developmental perspective might lead them to focus on student competencies.

They would probably view the goals of the school in terms of the cognitive and affective characteristics of their students.

From an agents perspective, the entire problem would look very different. School administrators would be concerned about their behavior and the purposes and goals that are fulfilled in administration. A goal of improving communication between administrators and teachers in the school would fall under this classification, as would a teacher's goal to provide more inquiry activity in his or her classroom. Under a democratic systems perspective, however, purposes and goals would relate to larger community or societal issues. Goals such as preparing knowledgeable citizens would fall under this classification. Thus, we see that the role of the school and the object of school governance would be different depending on the socialization perspective which was taken.

Although issues of purpose can be confronted directly by socialization approaches, some questions are altogether avoided. For example, none of the approaches helps in answering questions of student needs as perceived by the students themselves. None of the socialization approaches provide "bottom-up" strategies. They are all concerned with what happens when a given set of factors operates on the individual or on the unit of analysis. They do not consider how the self-declared needs of students can impact on school governance.

One current program, the School Environmental Impact Program, at Indiana University, is designed to surface a set of strategies for school governance based on students' needs.[1] An array of needs are being identified, and strategies for responding to those needs are being addressed. Such a program does not take any of the three socialization perspectives, but begins with the articulated needs of the student as a factual base for developing programs which will serve those needs. This perspective is not within the purview of socialization approaches, although consideration of the reverse direction of most socialization theories can help to guide such inquiry in the development of workable strategies for meeting student needs in schools.

Governance Structures

A second significant issue which is often raised in school and classroom governance involves the structure of the school or the classroom and its fit to the needs of the participants. Surely this issue is handled differently depending on the approach one takes. Many of the individualistic teaching strategies, for example, grow out of developmental socialization theories and certainly are implied by their findings. The same is true of school learning centers and modular scheduling designed to fit the needs of individual students.

On the other hand, when the agents approach is used, a great many different types of structures are developed in order to meet administrators' and teachers' managerial needs. Scheduling and school responsibilities for teachers are one example; another example would be the classroom which is structured to fit the teacher's needs for control.

A systems approach would necessitate an entirely different governance structure. In this case it would be determined in terms of the fit of the school structure to the general society or community, and the fit of the classroom to the school. A set of interlocking structures which serve the interests of the more general system would be considered. Classroom structure, for example, would reflect general school and systemic processes in a society, and teachers would attempt to model societal roles.

With this issue, too, there are several questions unanswered by any of the socialization approaches. Although a great deal of attention has been paid to the democratization of schools, few schools would be considered democracies. A larger question of whether or not nondemocratic structure of the school makes a measurable difference in student attitudes or behaviors, or their future societal roles, is left unanswered by socialization research under any of the perspectives.

Several studies have demonstrated contradictory results. One study conducted by Ehman and Gillespie (1974) demonstrated that both elite (meaning top-down) school organizations and participant (meaning consensual decision-making) organizations have positive effects on students' attitudes and participatory behavior. Although the participant structures promoted a greater degree of positive attitudes and participation, the relationship between the degree of authority and control exercised in the school and positive outcomes in terms of students' trust, integration, efficacy and participation habits was curvilinear rather than linear on the democratization continuum. These types of results need to be explored. Socialization approaches do not take such questions into account.

Nor do existing socialization approaches confront the question of the long-term impact of school structure or classroom governance. We have no idea, for example, whether or not authoritarian governance structures have a long-term authoritarian impact on their participants. Longitudinal studies which trace attitudes and behaviors of students over extended periods of time are needed before we can recognize the impact of the structure of school or classroom governance on participants within the school community.

Governance Processes

A third issue revolves around the process of governance. This is always a problem in schools. Key questions of representation and participation are constantly being tested and retested in most schools. They are often tested in classrooms.

Most of the socialization approaches provide scant attention to process variables. The systems approach probably offers the most direct focus on processes. Generally, studies have found that participation improves the process of governance in schools. Students, teachers, and administrators all directly benefit from their involvement in decision-making (Kirst, 1972). What is not clear is what impact different governance strategies have. If, for example, a majority rule is used in teacher meetings rather than a more exclusive decision process, it is not clear what short- or long-term difference the rule makes for teachers' attitudes and behaviors.

Even the systems approach leaves out key questions which are important in any overview of school and classroom governance processes. Questions about what types of participation are appropriate for various participants in the school community are left unaddressed by socialization theories. Key roles that individuals might take in school or classroom governance are left to speculation or determined by values rather than by adequate research findings. The question of the roles schools play in training students for participation is also left unanswered.

One recently published program, American Government: Comparing Political Experiences (Gillespie and Lazarus, 1979), teaches 12th grade students specific participation skills. It is the first course of its type in American government that systematically attempts to teach political participation competencies. We will only know through long-term studies whether or not student entry into the process of classroom governance has an impact. The same applies to school governance. Unless specific experiments, such as the government course described above, are designed in such a way that students can take a real part in the process of school governance, we will not know what the long-term impact is, nor will we be able to distinguish important and productive roles for participants.

A second major process question which remains largely unresolved by socialization research deals with how much participation in the process of governance is important to the development of habits of participation. Although the democratic systems approach brings this issue to the forefront, the degree to which someone needs to participate in a school environment in order to develop important habits for societal roles is not addressed by the democratic systems literature.

Currently, the Energy Education Curriculum Project in the State of Indiana[2] is attempting to develop a K-12 curriculum to improve habits of energy conservation among students. The curriculum stresses the development of competencies in individual and group decision-making and participation on energy issues. Data from this program may give some information about how habits are formed and how they are sustained through school environments; yet there is no comparable study from other national, state, or local curriculum efforts. Therefore, the question of how to develop sustained participation habits remains.

School Change

A fourth set of questions surrounds the subject of change in school and classroom environments. Socialization theories have been rightly categorized as static and supportive of the status quo. Even the most dynamic of them do not take into account changes in institutions that occur over time. Without some type of change theory built into socialization processes, they will be of little use to those who wish to understand socialization approaches to governance, or to those who wish to practice change in the schools.

There are several questions which highlight the barriers to approaching problems of change. Regardless of which socialization perspective is chosen, problems of aggregation face those interested in school governance. Suppose, for example, that we have an image of the ideal democratic polity. Suppose further that we have an idea of how schools socialize individuals into that polity. We are still operating on two levels. There is a macro or systems level, and the other is a micro or individual level. We do not yet know how people aggregate in order to make a systemic impact. Until new theories, findings, and practices dealing with problems of aggregation and size can be articulated, the question of how to train an individual for a social role which depends upon group impact, either in a formal group or in an aggregate, will not be resolved.

A second set of problems involves longitudinal analysis. Research conducted over long periods of time is needed in order to allow researchers to describe change processes as well as to explain them, both on the individual and the macro level. Until studies of long-term change are done, those who wish to improve and sustain long-term patterns of behavior will be at a loss as to the change dynamic which allows for the support or change of institutional structures.

An Ecological Approach

All of the perspectives and issues that have been raised here have led us to probe for a way that socialization approaches might be reconceptualized. The need for integration of these approaches is obvious; no single socialization theory will provide an adequate theoretical or practical base for the solution of problems in school governance and classroom climate.

One possible integrative approach may be termed ecological. Normally, one thinks of the environment when one thinks of ecology, and indeed, the socialization process does take place in both formal and informal environments inside and outside the school. In effect, rules of governance are part of the school's environment, but so are the physical facilities, the mobility patterns of administrators, teachers, and students, and other aspects of both the building and the symbolic environment. Therefore, when we talk about an ecological approach as integrating several socialization approaches, it is important to consider that the ecology of schools includes physical, psychological, symbolic, and interactional environments.[3]

An ecological approach would include a focus on individuals and their development. Major questions would involve developmental patterns and whether or not they are in harmony or in discord with the environment of schools or classrooms. Individuals, in effect, would be the points on the map through which we would plot the ecology of schools. Looking at a standard map, we might think of the cities as representing individuals.

The environment in and of itself would be an important factor. Here we integrate the systems approach to focus on rules and processes of government as part of the environment in which individuals interact. The divisions in the environment are the maze through which individuals move and are of major significance. Looking again at a map of the United States, for example, the environment of institutions could be seen as the state boundaries; the rules would regulate both within-state and between-state activities.

We would also be concerned with interaction. In effect, through group processes, interactions provide the cement between the individual and his or her environment. In this way, agents of socialization would be important as they provide role models for interactions with other individuals. The interactional ecology would provide the road maps between individuals, with the boundaries set by the school environment. Carrying the map analogy further, the interactional part of the environment would be represented by the communication lines existing between cities within and among states.

As has been shown, the ecological approach takes in all three socialization approaches and provides findings which take a holistic view of processes of school governance and practices in the classroom.

The integrative function of this approach can be further illustrated by looking at Susie, a typical middle school student. Under this approach, Susie would be viewed as interacting in a larger environment. Her development would be seen as influenced by and influencing a larger interactional network of which she is a part. The network would be a fluid, dynamic set of interlocking relationships with friends, family, school participants, and other socialization agents. Systemic rules, both formal and informal, that govern her attitudes and behaviors would be of major concern.

The ecological approach focuses on two major concepts which will aid our desire to provide a more multidimensional, holistic approach to socialization studies. Indeed, one major concept is that of integration, in this case between people and their environment. A second significant concept involves the human and nonhuman resources which can be used to improve the quality of that integration. Researchers and practitioners alike often segment their thinking about schools and underutilize the resources available to them. For these reasons, an ecological approach could add measurably to socialization research and school practice.

As these ideas demonstrate, the ecological approach can provide integration for a variety of socialization theories. Although the ecological perspective itself is relatively well-developed, it has not been applied to socialization processes. It is our belief that integrating ecological and socialization perspectives could provide a dynamic and important contribution both to understanding the socialization of individuals and groups, and to the study of the ecology of schools.

Conclusion

One obvious, yet important, general conclusion to this review is that if socialization theories are to be effectively utilized to understand school governance and classroom climate, they need to be related in some way to educational theories. Although we have created some vague relationships here, no one has really attempted to inquire systematically into possible patterns of correspondence between the two. For example, do developmental approaches imply humanistic, individualistic, or programmed approaches to instruction? Do democratic theory approaches imply participant forms of education in which students and teachers jointly determine educational goals? Thinking through possible patterns of correspondence would greatly enhance the potential of any socialization approach.

There are a great many research implications which stem from this review. For research purposes, it is clear that studies should focus on the dynamics of the socialization process and combine perspectives across various socialization approaches. Research, to be realistic and usable, should also include people from the schools in its design, administration, and implementation.

If research were undertaken using an ecological approach with a socialization basis, new findings about socialization dynamics would be possible. At this point, there is very little known about the dynamics of growth or change in school environments or in school classrooms. Only through this combination of approaches could we discover the main change processes from a holistic perspective.

In terms of practice, the study indicates that sheer awareness of socialization processes by school personnel is important. Once awareness is created, however, it is important to see socialization not as a static phenomenon, but rather as a dynamic one. School personnel need to be as aware of long-term changes that are occurring in students and other participants in the school community as they are of the knowledge or cognitive gains that are measured by achievement factors. Finally, a variety of factors need to be considered by school educators because the school is only one part of the socialization process. More attention needs to be paid on a practical level to education going on in churches, places of work, and other community institutions.

Again, the ecological approach could help school practitioners to realize to a much greater extent the physical, psychological, and sociodynamic aspects of their environment. If research were conducted from this perspective, it could contribute explanatory recommendations for school change, as well as suggest ways to improve school environments to fit the maximum potential of administrators, teachers, and students.

The ecological approach is certainly not the only solution to the problem of the integration of socialization theories, yet it bears special attention given its integrative function and its explanatory potential. We look forward to a future when ecological studies with a socialization base will serve as the basis for a critique such as this one, so that we can see whether a new approach will fill important gaps in understanding and help the practice of education in schools. After all, without both the research and the practical application, socialization theories will remain topics for conferences rather than operational aids for improving education.

Reference Notes

1. The School Environmental Impact Program is directed by Judith Gillespie at the Program in Educational Policy and Change at Indiana University. The Program is funded by the Indiana Department of Public Instruction. For further information, contact the Director at the following address: Program for Educational Policy and Change, Workshop on Political Theory and Policy Analysis, 814 East Third Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.
2. The Energy Education Curriculum Project is directed by Judith Gillespie at the Program in Educational Policy and Change at Indiana University. The Program is funded by the Indiana Department of Public Instruction. For further information, contact the Director at the following address: Program in Educational Policy and Change, Workshop on Political Theory and Policy Analysis, 814 East Third Street, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.
3. The best articulation of the ecological approach to the study of schools we have found is in Lee F. Anderson, The Ecology of Political Education in the United States, paper delivered at the Conference on Political Education in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, September, 1975.

References

Bloom, B. (Ed.), *Taxonomy of educational objectives, the classification of educational goals, handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: David McCay Company, Inc., 1956.

Bruner, J. S. *The process of education*. New York: Vintage, 1960.

Chaffee, S. H. *The mass media as agents of political socialization*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Political Socialization and Political Education, Tutzing, F. R. G., October 10-14, 1977.

Dahl, R. A. *A preface to democratic theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Easton, D., & Dennis, J. *Children in the political system*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Ehman, L. H. An analysis of the relationships of selected educational variables with the political socialization of high school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 1969, *6* (4), 559-580.

Ehman, L. H. *The function of the school in the political socialization process: American findings*. Paper prepared for the International Conference on Political Socialization and Political Education, Tutzing, F. R. G., October 10-14, 1977.

Ehman, L. H., & Gillespie, J. A. *Political life in the hidden curriculum: Does it make a difference?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Chicago, November 1974.

Erikson, E. *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York: Norton Press, 1968.

Gillespie, J. A., & Lazarus, S. *American government: Comparing political experiences*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.

Ginsburg, H., & Opper, S. *Piaget's theory of intellectual development: An introduction*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Hess, R., & Torney, J. *The development of political attitudes in children*. Chicago: Aldine Press, 1967.

Kirst, M. W. (Ed.), *State, school and politics: Research directions*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath, 1972.

Kohlberg, L. Stages of moral development and bases for moral education. In C. M. Beck, B. S. Crittenden, & E. V. Sullivan (Eds.), Moral education: Interdisciplinary approaches. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Langton, K. P., & Jennings, M. K. Political socialization and the high school course curriculum in the United States. American Political Science Review, 1968, 62 (3), 852-867.

McCloskey, H. Consensus and ideology in American Politics. American Political Science Review, 1964, 58 (2), 361-382.

Newmann, F. M. with Oliver, D. W. Clarifying public controversy: An approach to teaching social studies. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.

Pateman, C. Participation and democratic theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Remy, R. The challenge of citizenship education today. United States Office of Education paper, August, 1977.

2

THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN:

CHALLENGES IN TODAY'S WORLD

David Elkind

Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Study

Tufts University

The issue of children's rights is a very large topic and one that can be addressed from many different perspectives. This is true because children have many different sets of rights: political, social, legal, human, and so on. Each of these sets of rights is important and poses challenges in today's world. Although I wish that I were able to speak to these many different set of rights, that is beyond my range of competence. I am a developmental psychologist and the only domain I can address with authority is that of children's psychological rights. It is these psychological rights that will be the focus of this presentation.

Before proceeding to that discussion, however, it might be well to say something about the concept of rights in general. As I understand the concept of rights, it has to do with entitlement, with birthrights, with what is due to children as a consequence of their existence as human beings. The challenge which any set of rights poses, then, is how to ensure that children receive what is their due, that to which they are entitled. Accordingly, in talking about children's psychological rights, we must begin with their psychological entitlement and then look at the challenges which that entitlement imposes.

Children's Psychological Rights

From a developmental point of view children can be said to be growing, knowing and showing individuals. Children grow in ability, in knowledge, in skill, in sensitivity, tact, understanding and much more. Children are also knowing individuals inasmuch as they are continually trying to make sense out of the physical and social worlds in which they live. Finally, children are showing individuals in the sense that they seek to express or to represent to others the progress of their growth, and of their attempts to make sense out of their world. Talking, writing, dancing, painting, and sculpting are but some of the ways children demonstrate their symbolizing nature.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to suggest that these basic psychological propensities of children be considered rights and that children are entitled to their realization. If we accept that children have a right to grow, to know and to show, what challenges does the future pose to their realization? In answering this question I will limit the discussion to our American experience. This is necessary not only for reasons of space but also because children's psychological rights are conceived differently in different societies.

The Right to Grow

As suggested earlier, the child's right to grow has many different facets: intellectual, personal, and social. To my mind some of these rights to grow are in particular danger today, and it is these that I want to talk about in detail. First, there is the child's right to grow as a totality which is challenged by professional differentiation. Second, there is the child's right to grow at his or her own pace and time that is challenged by a misreading of our American value system. We need to address each of these rights in turn.

The right to grow as a totality. At a recent national conference for child development researchers, I became increasingly uneasy as I sat through session after session of research reports. There were discussions of memory, of metamemory, of space, time, perception, language and social cognition. I was very impressed by the elegance of the research designs and the sophistication of the conceptualizations. What I missed was any sense of a child as a totality and any recognition that the nature of memory, metamemory and so on, might be very much influenced by the character of that totality. To be sure, for research purposes it is necessary to deal with specific dimensions and this research focus does little practical harm so long as the researchers refrain from making practical suggestions. Where the lack of recognition of the child is a growing totality is much more pernicious is the whole area of children with special needs. A personal experience may help to exemplify what I mean. Some years ago, I had the good fortune to visit a small residential school for emotionally troubled young people. The facility was run by a husband and wife team. He was a retired, successful auto executive and she was a gifted psychiatric social worker. Together they created, in the mountains of Colorado, one of the most successful therapeutic environments I have ever seen.

The ingredients of that environment were easy to see, if not to duplicate. First, there were the personalities of the two people who were strong, gifted and caring. Then there was the family atmosphere. They boys helped with the farming, the animal husbandry and the household chores. The former auto executive took the lead and taught them the basics of farming and mechanics. He and his wife together offered regular sessions devoted to formal schooling. And in the evenings, they provided their own entertainment with games, music, storytelling, and reading.

Not long after I visited, the husband died of a heart attack. The facility was taken over by a younger couple who obtained grant support and brought in teachers, counselors, and therapists. In the new setup, a farmer taught the boys to farm, a teacher taught them to read, and a counselor taught them to play. Each function became identified with a different person. Moreover, each person, teacher, farmer, or counselor understandably felt that his or her contribution had the major therapeutic effect. In fact, of course, the success of the program diminished significantly.

I have seen this happen in other settings. I think what happens is that professional differentiation of children's services can take place at the expense of the child's right to grow as a totality. Children become attached to only a few adults, and this attachment is a prime motivation for socialization, including schooling. When that attachment is divided among many adults, its motivating power is lost. In addition, and equally important, the child loses an opportunity to be treated as a whole person, the primary means by which children can come to think of themselves as whole people, too.

The threat to children's right to grow as totalities (particularly those children with special needs) is also threatened by our tendency to think of children in terms of labels. I recall visiting a lab school for learning disabled children. The rooms were small and contained little else besides a few desks and a blackboard. In each room a teacher worked intently with the children on math, or reading or writing. When I wondered out loud about the absence of color, plants, animals, and manipulative materials, I was told that these would distract the children from their learning.

Although this example is perhaps an extreme case, it highlights the tendency to teach to a child's labelled deficits, not to the child. We become so concerned with remediating a part, that we forget the whole. But a child is not a disembodied deficit, nor is a deficit that concrete embodiment of a child. The concentration on a child's deficiencies, however well-intentioned, violates the child's right to grow and function as a totality. We can help such children best by recognizing their strengths as well as their weaknesses, their feelings as well as their verbal responses, and their need for play and creative expression as well as for work.

Our language is unfortunate in the sense that it places the adjective before the noun. We speak of the deaf child, the blind child, the speech handicapped or the learning disabled child. Language suggests an order of priority which is contrary to the child's right to grow as a totality. But language is a servant, not a master, and should not determine our practice. In Massachusetts, we speak of children with special needs. That, to me, puts the priorities where they should be, the child first and the speciality second. Language is much easier to change than children and while changes in language use will not cure the problem I have described, I think it is an important and easily adopted corrective.

The child, then, has a right to grow as a totality. Two challenges to this right to grow as a whole person are the differentiation of professional services for children on the one hand and the diagnostic labelling and treatment of children on the other. To be sure, professional differentiation is important but it may go too far, to the point where it benefits the professionals more than the children served. In the same way diagnostic labelling is valuable so long as the needs of the whole child are kept in mind. It is only when the label, the part, is taken for the child, the whole, that damage is done. The challenge for the future is to ensure that the continued professionalization of services for children and more refined diagnostic categories do not threaten their right to grow as total persons.

The right to grow at one's own rate and pace. We must, I think, admit a peculiar paradox in modern society. Prior to Darwin, men believed in their divine origin and rejected any kinship to animal species. Yet, at the same time, people in preindustrial societies were very well aware of their biological nature and accepted it with a certain zestful vigor.

Today, in our post industrial age we know very well that we are descended from apes and our animal lineage is well established. But, perhaps because modern society is so far removed from nature, we often ignore our biology and treat ourselves and others as if we were machines, not organismic beings.

This is particularly true in psychology and in education. In psychology, for example, the tremendous impact originally made by Piaget is already blunted. We hear, from respectable voices, that the concept of stages is passé, that infants can do what Piaget said only children can do, and that growth is nothing more than the gradual accretion of knowledge. In education, too, the concern with the problem of the match, as J. McV. Hunt called it, is no longer considered relevant. There is no need to match the child's abilities with appropriate curriculum materials; all one needs to do is teach skills, and these can be taught as early as you wish. "Let's get back to the basics of curriculum and ignore this child development rubbish."

How easy it is to forget that we are biological as well as spiritual beings. Piaget noted this tendency in what he called "the American question": if most children attain a certain stage at age six, how can we get them to attain it at age four? Yet, we know that it takes an infant nine months to mature in the womb and no one, to my knowledge, has argued that we should accelerate that process. I have not heard anyone say, well, if it usually takes nine months, why can't it get to happen in seven months, or three months. Yet, once the baby is out of the womb, we seem to lose our awareness that growth takes time. While we are merely impatient with the time it takes for children to learn to walk and to talk, we are absolutely champing at the curriculum bit that will get them to acquire cognitive, athletic and social skills early.

We see this eagerness in the current efforts to teach math and reading at even younger ages, at the introduction of team competitive sports in the elementary school grades, and at the dress and hair styles of children that are miniature replicas of those of their parents. We want children to grow up fast intellectually, emotionally and socially and we refuse to recognize that the constraints on growth, which operated within the womb, continue to operate outside it.

Consider just a few facts. The body configuration of the preschool child is quite different from that of adults. Preschool children are mostly head; it makes up about a fourth of their body size. Bones and muscles are not fully formed and remain soft. Many motor coordinations are far from well established and children have trouble walking a balance beam and throwing and catching a ball. Children also tend to have tunnel vision and to be unresponsive to visual stimuli in the periphery of their visual field. I mention these facts because they are so often forgotten when preschool children are treated as if they were fully formed.

Whence comes this pressure to grow up fast, this violation of children's right to grow at their own rate and pace? It comes in part, as I have suggested, from our modern tendency to deny our biological nature despite--or maybe because of--Darwin. But it has other roots as well. These lie in some misinterpretations of our American value system. The problem lies, or so it seems to me, in a misunderstanding of the concept that "All men are created equal." The founders of this country meant this in a political and a legal sense. All people are equal under the law and should have equal access to education, jobs, and property regardless of race, creed or religion.

Unfortunately, this political and legal doctrine, which is the bedrock of our democracy, has been made into a psychological postulate as well. It has been interpreted not as meaning equal access under the law, but equal ability and talent. Consequently, in our society, it is regarded as immodest to admit talent or ability. What one can admit to is hard work. "Success is 99% perspiration and only 1% inspiration." Achievement is a function of motivation, not ability or talent. If you don't succeed in our society, it is because you didn't work hard enough, you didn't want it enough. For adults, this misconstrued egalitarianism may be a helpful rationalization for the inevitable failures encountered in our society.

This psychologicalization of the equal rights doctrine becomes pernicious when it is extended to children. The denial of limits based on differences in ability and talent in adults gets translated into a denial of limits and constraints grounded in age differences in children. Age differences in achievement among children are treated as if they were individual differences in achievement among adults. As in the case of adults, the differences are looked upon as evidence of different experiences, and motivations rather than differences in ability and talent.

But adults do vary in talent and ability and children at different age levels are different in their intellectual competencies. It is not un-American to recognize differences in individual talents and abilities. It is un-American to deny anyone the opportunity to realize and express those abilities and talents. So it is not unpatriotic to say that there are limits to what children can do physically, motorically, intellectually and socially. It must be understood that children are born equal under the law, but not upon the delivery table.

Instead of engaging our efforts in concerted attempts to deny the limits set by maturation and development--so much time, effort, money and intelligence is wasted in that enterprise--we might better put our energies into ensuring that children have opportunities under the law to realize their individual differences. To instill in teachers, parents, administrators and legislators a knowledge and a respect for the limits set by our biological nature is the real challenge to children's right to grow at their own pace and in their own time.

The Right to Know

Children are knowing individuals in the sense that they are continually trying to make sense out of the world in which they live. Making sense out of the world means putting it into a conceptual framework that has logical consistency and order. Children, perhaps even more than adults, need a predictable world that follows rules and social conventions. Although we, as adults, acknowledge the child's right to become acquainted with this world, we sometimes fail to allow children to make sense out of the world in their own way. It is my belief that a child's right to know in his or her own way is every bit as important as the right to know itself.

There are at least three ways in which we as adults interfere with children's right to know in their own way. One way is our failure to differentiate between affective and cognitive interests. Another is our failure to distinguish between individual and collective knowledge, and the third is the failure to distinguish between the child's conception of reality and our own. These confusions present the real challenge to the child's right to make sense out of the world in his or her way.

Before proceeding, it is necessary to qualify the notion that a child has a right to know in his or her own way. Like all rights, that right is relative, not absolute. The child does not, indeed should not, learn everything in his or her own way. A child should not learn to avoid fire by being burned or to stay out of the street by being hit by a car. There is much that children need to be taught about the physical and social world. So the idea that children have a right to learn in their own way is not an argument against adult intervention. It _is_ an argument for taking the child's ways of knowing into account whenever we engage in instruction.

The child's affective and cognitive interests. Perhaps one of the most widespread challenges to the child's right to know in his or her own way is the confusion between the child's affective and cognitive interests. It is particularly troublesome because it often appears to be progressive teaching. Consider the following, quite common example. Some preschool boys have become enamoured of dinosaurs. They want to hear stories about dinosaurs, look at pictures of dinosaurs, and play with plastic replicas of dinosaurs. Quite understandably, the teacher wants to build upon this spontaneous interest to instruct children in concepts that will benefit their school learning. He or she wants the children to appreciate something of the size of dinosaurs, something about how long ago they lived, why they failed to survive and so on. The idea of building on children's spontaneous interests seems to make such good pedagogical sense that to question it would almost appear as heresy. But we must question because it reflects a fundamental confusion between the child's affective interests (the need to deal with emotional conflicts) and the child's cognitive interests (the need to exercise a maturing ability).

Why, after all, are preschool children interested in dinosaurs? My guess is that it is for the same reasons that they are interested in witches and ogres, fairy godmothers and handsome princes. We don't try to teach around stories about witches and ogres because we recognize that they have dynamic, symbolic significance for children. So, too, do dinosaurs. Children are interested in dinosaurs because they symbolize power and size that are nonetheless distant and which the children are able to control. Dinosaurs allow children to work through, in a symbolic way, power struggles with the giants in their world. The proof of this is that once the issue is resolved, children drop dinosaurs as swiftly as they picked them up.

Children, then, are interested in dinosaurs for dynamic, not curricular reasons. To build curriculum content into the dinosaur interest prevents the child from knowing about them in his or her own way. Although teachers can feed the child's interest in dinosaurs with books, pictures and models, the interest should not be transformed into a lesson plan. Although the child may learn something cognitively from classifying dinosaurs, the real value of this interest lies in its cathartic power. We must be careful not to deprive children of the symbolic significance of their affective interests by overstructuring the activity.

This confusion between affective and cognitive interest helps to explain a lot of the poor curriculum in our schools. For example, first grade children may express an interest in learning about the planets that the second graders are studying. But this is an affective, not a cognitive interest. They want to do what the next age group is doing and don't have a clue as to what planets are all about. They don't, by the way, have a clue to what planets are all about even after they have studied them in second grade. Planets--the size, distance and so on--are simply too abstract for young elementary school children to understand.

There are, however, many cognitive interests that children do display and that are appropriate to build upon in a curricular way. When young children begin to count and use quantity terms, they show that they are eager and ready to get into measuring activities. Children's fascination with how things work is an abiding cognitive interest that one can build upon in a curricular way. So, too, children's curiosity about animals, plants and nature in general provides a rich repository of cognitive interests upon which to build curriculum projects. Building curriculum around cognitive interests is the epitome of good teaching.

How, one might ask, can you tell affective interests from cognitive ones? Usually the content of affective interests is inappropriate to the child's cognitive level. Dinosaurs and Indians are removed from what children can understand and use to nourish their cognitive growth. The Star Wars materials, Superman, and Tarzan are all of that genre. They have primarily affective, not cognitive, significance. In contrast, children's collections, or their concern with building or with learning about and caring for animals are activities that can nourish their budding cognitive abilities.

It would be a mistake, of course, to make too strong a line between cognitive and affective interests. Clearly the activities generated by affective interests often yield cognitive gains. Likewise, activities initiated by children's cognitive interests may have positive emotional benefits. But there is a difference and that is where talented teaching and parenting comes in. When to fertilize an activity and when to prune it are delicate decisions that gifted child watchers learn intuitively but which others can acquire with diligence. Indeed, one of the great challenges to a child's right to know in his or her own way, primarily cognitively or affectively, is to provide adults who are sensitive to the quality as well as to the content of children's interests.

Individual and Collective Knowledge. A second challenge to the child's right to know comes from the confusion between collective knowledge and individual knowledge. By individual knowledge I mean the sequence in which an individual acquires knowledge as well as the body of knowledge he or she has acquired. By collective knowledge I also mean the social interaction sequences that are involved in accumulating the knowledge in a given discipline as well as that knowledge itself. When defined in this way, it is clear that the way an individual goes about acquiring collective knowledge is not the same as the way collective knowledge is accumulated and organized. In acquiring collective knowledge, the child does not recapitulate the sequence that marked the accumulation of collective knowledge itself.

Although no one today, as far as I know, makes the argument for recapitulation, another sort of confusion between collective and individual knowledge is prevalent. In a sense this new approach is the antithesis of the recapitulation argument. If the child does not discover the truths of mathematics by following the sequence of historical discoveries in mathematics, what sequence should we use in instruction? The answer has been an analytic one. Let us analyze mathematics into its most basic components from which all others derive. If we give children these basic components, then they will have a solid foundation upon which to build all of their own mathematical learning.

Unfortunately, the basic components solution to the relation between individual and collective knowledge is as fallacious as the recapitulation doctrine. The basic fallacy lies in the fact that one cannot really appreciate or understand the basic elements of a discipline without understanding the discipline as a whole. It is only because the mathematician, chemist, or physicist has a conception of collective knowledge as a whole in that area that he or she is able to distill the common elements. This is a basic tenet of concept formation generally, namely, that you experience a wide range of instances of the concept before constructing the common features. To teach children the common elements before they have experienced the whole is like teaching them that a circle encloses 360' of arc without ever showing them balls or targets.

Many of the curricula of the 60s suffered from this fallacious analogy between individual and collective knowledge. What is missed and what needs to be emphasized is that the acquisition of individual knowledge, like the acquisition of collective knowledge, is an empirical historical issue, not an analytic one. If we want to know how the discipline of mathematics came to be what it is today, we have to study the history of mathematics. And if we want to understand how individuals acquire mathematical knowledge, we have to study the emergence of mathematical thinking in the child. Both individual and collective knowledge have a history and that is where their commonality rests.

The Child's Reality and Adult Reality. A third way in which the child's right to know can be clocked is through a confusion between the child's reality and the reality of adults. Let me give you some examples of what I mean. Children's questions are a case in point. I recall a young man of five who ran into the kitchen one afternoon. He was confused and upset and asked his mother, "Mommy, what is a period?" His mother, of course, assumed that one of his friends had told him about menstruation and replied angrily, "Who told you about periods?" To which her son replied, "Janie was angry at me and said "You can't come to my party, period!"

Such instances are, of course, commonplace. They dramatize the difference between the child's and the adult's conception of the world. The child has a right to know and to have his or her questions answered. But it is important that we answer the questions in ways that make sense to the child. When a child asks what makes the sun shine, it really is of little help if we explain the relations between heat and light. Children are interested in purposes, motives, not scientific abstractions. An appropriate answer to the child's question about sunshine is to say "to help the grass and flowers grow, and to keep us warm."

One might argue, of course, that children need factual knowledge and that an answer of the sort that I have described is in effect "coddling the child." My own sense is that this is not the case. In contemporary society children are challenged on all sides by words, concepts, and experiences that they do not understand. This provides all the challenges they need for intellectual development. Answering questions at their level communicates respect and understanding for their world view and makes children feel cared for and loved. Children have a right to that kind of knowledge as well.

The Right to Show

A basic human propensity is to show or express our emotions, our feelings, our thoughts, and our discoveries about ourselves and the world. This propensity is present at all levels of development but is particularly prevalent in childhood where the sheer newness of the world makes children brim full of expressive reactions. Too often, however, adults block this expressiveness as if it were mere idle chatter; hence, the maxim "Children should be seen and not heard." The same attitude is reflected in teachers who take children to a museum but spend most of the time trying to keep the children quiet.

This bias against expression in children reflects a bias against expressive modes of learning in general. There is no general acceptance of the fact that expression is not just mental foam but has body as well, and that it is an important mode of learning. Where children talk, write, draw, paint, build or in other ways attempt to express their experience, they are learning in the most comprehensive and the most socially beneficial way. The failure to understand the importance of children's expressive activities is perhaps the most important challenge to the child's right to show.

The failure to appreciate expressive learning stems, or so it seems to me, from a confusion about play, work and creative expression and their role in education. It might be well, then, to talk about these concepts in a little more detail and to look at them from a developmental point of view. But, first of all, it is necessary to take a moment and undo a bit of damage that was unwittingly done by Maria Montessori when she echoed a then prevalent idea that "play is the child's work."

What Montessori was reflecting was the view, current in the early 1900s when she was writing, that play was a preparation for life. The play of young animals seemed to mimic the activity of adults and, hence, was regarded as a preparation for it. In the same way, when children play house, this is a preparation for real role taking in adulthood. It was in this sense, the sense of play as social adaptation or as preparation for life, that it was called work. But this equation clouded the important differences between work and play and has led, in Montessori education in particular, to a denigration of fantasy and creative expression.

From a developmental standpoint, namely, a Piagetian point of view, there are two poles of adaptation, individual and social. Individual adaptation is expressed in the process of assimilation, whereas the individual transforms the environment to suit his or her needs and interests. Social adaptation is accommodation, the transformation of the individual to meet the demands and the constraints of the physical and social environment. Individual adaptation or assimilation is play, while social adaptation accommodation is work.

It is important to emphasize that this way of looking at work and play rules out any affective dimension. Both work and play can be pleasurable or painful. On the other hand, this view of play means that we reconsider the labels we attach to some aspects of children's activity. When children are setting the table in a Montessori classroom with real glasses and real plates, this is not play, it is work. But when children are depicting adult roles in the doll corner, this is play, because the children have transformed the dolls into babies and because they are using the situation to express individual needs and propensities.

In other words, play is not the child's work. The child's work goes on as he or she learns social conventions, such as saying please or thank you, or eating according to accepted practice. All of these socially adaptive activities, these accommodations, are the child's work. The child's play--his or her symbolic games, painting, movement, and talking--are ways children have of expressing who and what they are and what experience means to them filtered through their own unique needs, interests, activities and talents. Play in its purest sense is individual; work at its most clearly defined is social.

But there are some activities wherein the individual and the social are combined. To do this well takes talent but all children have some propensity for it. The coordination of play and work of individual expression and social adaptation is most clearly seen in art and in science. The artist, in giving expression to personal themes, nonetheless taps into something that is universal. The artist expresses something that is experienced by others in addition to himself or herself and, thus, transcends both work and play with an achievement that is at once individual and social.

Science operates in much the same way. The creative scientist gives expression to his or her unique integration of phenomena but this holds for others as well and helps others to understand the phenomena which they could not have understood otherwise. The creative scientist, like the creative artist, transcends the dichotomy between individual and social, between play and work, in a unique achievement that combines them. This is what Piaget means by equilibration.

Accordingly, what we must come to appreciate is the importance of art and of science in education generally. Both art and science provide avenues for children to coordinate their need for individual expression with their need for social accommodation. The human propensity to show, to express, takes its highest form in these activities. The real challenge to children's right to expression is to convey to parents and to educators that art and science are not just incidental to learning but are, rather, critical to it. It is not accidental, after all, that our colleges are called colleges of arts and sciences. What we need to recognize is that arts and science are as important to children as they are to college students, provided, of course, that they are taught in ways appropriate to children's level of intellectual development.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that children have three basic psychological rights. The first right is to grow both as a totality and at one's own pace and in one's own time. Challenges to these rights come from professional role differentiation and labelling and from the American value system which makes us refuse to acknowledge children's limitations. The second right is the child's propensity to know or make sense out of the world in his or her own way. This right is challenged by adult confusion between the personal and the school curriculum, between individual and collective knowledge, and between adult and child conceptions of reality. Finally, the third psychological right is the child's right to express his or her personal and social experience. This right is challenged by a failure to recognize expression as a mode of learning, by the confusion between work and play, and by the failure to recognize that art and science are integrative activities that are of the highest importance at all levels of schooling.

In conclusion, children have psychological as well as legal, social, and political rights. It is important in these days of child advocacy and courses in parenting, that we take children's psychological rights into account. For example, giving children the power to choose which parent to live with in the case of divorce may protect the child's legal rights but violate the child's psychological right to grow at his or her own pace and time. Such decisions are, from a psychological point of view, not appropriate for a child to make.

Today, we are concerned with many different perspectives on children's rights. Such concern and activity is on the whole beneficial. But it does have dangers and therein lies the greatest challenge of all. Somehow, as we deal with children's rights in specific domains, we must manage to keep the whole child in mind. We have to remember that legal rights affect medical rights and psychological rights and that they cannot be considered in isolation. In the end, the right to be treated as a total person is the most important right of all.

3

THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND CITIZEN EDUCATION

Paul V. Gump

Department of Psychology

The University of Kansas

We at the conference undoubtedly share the belief that citizen education is profoundly shaped by more than a school's curricular offering. Russell Hill's position paper, which we all read as background, noted that students "live within a social/political organization when they are at school" (Hill, 1978, p. 19). Hill could have added that staff also live in this sociopolitical organization. Just how we understand this system has much to do with how we plan for citizen education. My field, ecological psychology, proposes a set of units and variables to describe schools which I want to discuss. I would also like to indicate their importance in determining student and teacher behavior in the educational arena.

The basic unit in our conception of organizations, institutions, and communities is the synomorph. We deliberately propose this somewhat technical label, when other more commonsense words such as "lessons," "activities," "offices," "programs," or "settings," might seem to do as well. But the problem with commonsense words is that they have accrued meanings which do not reflect the precise idea behind the label, synomorph.

A minimum requirement for a position paper is that its author inform the reader just what it is he is talking about. We communicate our concepts either by definition or by illustration; I should like to take the time here to do the latter, to offer several verbal pictures of school synomorphs. These examples can communicate the idea of the synomorph unit and also hint at how such units are fundamental in considering the operating environment in which we hope to develop the motives and the competencies basic to citizen behavior.

Here is one of the first occurring synomorphs of the school day for an open design, elementary school this past winter. At 7:30 A.M., three second- and third-grade teachers met around a table and discussed their professional activities for the immediate future. Elements of their teaching program were evaluated; plans were laid for substantial changes in student assignment; representation at a regional meeting was discussed and feedback to other teachers and administrators on the success of a recent school-wide Christmas event was formulated. An agenda was followed, and minutes were taken. At 8:20, the meeting closed as 180 young pupils started bustling in from the cold out-of-doors.

Around 8:30, another quite different synomorph operated. The physical aspect for this synomorph should be described. This school building includes a large "centrum"--locally labelled as "the pit." The pit will accommodate the entire school. It is oval shaped and exhibits four levels of seating: that of the school floor itself and then three more descending tiers curving around inside, providing step-like seats for students. At one segment of the oval, the floor or top level projects somewhat inside the oval to provide a simple but highly visible "stage." All is carpeted and clean. This physical arrangement is important because it provides for school-wide participation in daily morning events. Further, the seating on four levels with a semicircular array means that most students can be seen by most other students. The program of the assembly includes school announcements and news, awards to student groups who behaved well in cafeteria, and then something special. On another day, this special happening involved recognition of the retiring president of the school council. A slight, dark-haired girl graciously received kind words from a teacher-sponsor and warm applause from fellow students. On this particular day, the special event was singing nonsensical songs with appropriate gestures, brightly led by the drama teacher. The ditty "I've Got the Crazies, How About You?" aroused frequent exchanges of looks and grins.

At 8:45, the assembly ended. On some days, pupils go to various niches and spaces to have "rap sessions" with other students and with the teacher they have selected. On this day, the postassembly synomorph was unrestricted reading. Children sought out the spots and postures which seemed good to them. Some lounged over the tiers in the pit, some were in chairs, (but not as many as one might suppose), some were at desks, a few were on top of desks, and two were even tucked away beneath desks. The children read, the teachers read, the principal read--all material of their own choosing. Everybody left everybody else alone and everybody read.

Around 9:30, this second school-wide synomorph ceased and pupils streamed back to their base areas. Now began the more academic learning synomorphs: seatwork sessions, reading circles, and spelling games supervised by aides. Small groups were the mode; 20 to 30 group activities might be distributed across the 180 children at any one time. I will not continue the sketch of synomorphs since enough has been said to indicate that the entire school day could be described in terms of the number and kind of settings in operation.

With that concrete description of synomorphs as a starting background, two major discussions can follow: the delineation of the conceptual nature of the units described; and the illustration of how qualities of these units might relate to citizen education.

The synomorphs described above exhibited a similar basic construction: a physical milieu, a standing pattern of action (or mini-program), and a fit between the two. The pit assembly, for example, possessed a physical layout quite supportive to the kind of "congregating behavior" that was desired. Without a physical array of this size and shape, it would not be possible to manage such a large and socially interactive program. The fit between the milieu and the program of a setting is a kind of "similarity of shape," a relation called synomorphy; hence the label synomorph for environmental-behavior units of this type. A final aspect of these synomorphs, making them true units rather than environmental fragments, is their boundedness. Quite clear limits or edges of space and of time operated for each of the three synomorphs described.

Before considering the importance of synomorph qualities, it is important to note the conceptual nature of such units. The units exhibit several virtues that should appeal to persons researching or manipulating school environments. First, these are not psychological units; they are environmental ones. Psychological units and descriptors, it seems to us in ecological psychology, often lead to vagary and circularity in thinking. For example, we have terms like the "invisible curriculum." Such a term is poetic, even provocative, but what can it mean? If the phenomena are truly invisible, we have no way of understanding them, no chance of manipulating them for positive social ends. If they are visible, what would one see? The synomorphs described could have been given labels such as organizational meeting, school assembly, or reading period; but these labels hardly carry all the meanings, the environmental qualities, intrinsic to these synomorphs. There was, for example, the highly social, immediate, unifying quality of the nonsense singing game at the assembly. The game is doubtless intended to do more than entertain; it is also physically and behaviorally patterned to yield some feeling of social connectedness, of community. The exchange of grins observed indicates that the purpose was probably being realized. Much of the so-called "invisible curriculum" is either a highly visible part of the standing pattern of behavior (or program) of the various synomorphs, or it is part of the behavioral reaction to such program. In either case, it can be identified and measured.

Further, when we consider the relation of the human environment to individual behavior, we need to describe each in terms relevant to, but conceptually independent of, one another. To avoid circularity of thinking, we need to establish a separation between environments and persons' responses to them. Much pride has been taken in referring to the importance of the phenomenological or the psychological environment. But this kind of thinking springs from the inability of most psychologists to get outside their framework, even when that would seem manifestly necessary. To explain: Suppose it can be shown that pupils who report that their school environment is psychologically supportive, will also show better attendance. The psychologist happily reports that, as predicted, the kind of environment predicted the kind of response to it. But this is a circular relationship. The out-of-the-skin, preperceptual environment was, in fact, never measured; what we have are two aspects of the children's response to the external environment. One aspect deals with feeling, another with behavioral reaction. Anyone aware of the human tendency to develop consistency between feeling and action is not surprised when the two correlate.

Use of measures of the subjective environment has an important but strictly limited place in our efforts to understand and to construct school environments. When we search for relationships between the external environment and the individual's behavior and experience, the subjective environment is much more a dependent variable than an independent one. The fact that whole books are now appearing describing such subjective environments (e.g., Moos, 1979) does not diminish the inherent limitation to the use of subjective environments. The circularity between "how one sees the situation" and "how one reacts to the situation" has fundamental practical implications. In principle, a school staff can directly change the physical milieu and the behavioral program that goes with it; but they cannot directly alter the perceptual world, the life space, the phenomenological environment. The place to start is with the environmental settings, the synomorphs, and then check possible effects on the subjective environments and on the individual behaviors in these settings. Basically, educators are not, and should not be, psychologists; they are setting-creators and managers. Much of the time, it can be shown, they don't even teach, in the pedagogical sense of that word. Instead, they create, rearrange, monitor, manage and protect settings in which learning is supposed to occur (Conant, 1973; Gump, 1975; Jackson, 1968).

Another favorite term of those who would emphasize psychological variables is "climate." In geography, climate has sound objective referents; in social science, we use the term when we are not sure what we mean but we want to indicate something beyond the objective measurements available, perhaps phenomena beyond the strictly formal or structural characteristics of a place or an organization. Now when we wish to point to the response of persons and groups to aspects of their environment, the term is still vague but at least it's located reasonably well. When climate is taken as "the environment," as it surely is in matters geographical, we are slipping back into circularity between the preperceptual environment and inhabitant reaction to it.

Our position is that many of the meanings suggested (but not specified) by words such as "climate" and "invisible curriculum" can be clarified by use of synomorph properties--or by noting behavioral and experiential responses to synomorphs.

For example, an examination of the first synomorph presented, the teachers' meeting, shows that the professionals operated with considerable independence; and that they had the power to restructure their curriculum (no administrator was present). It also shows that the teachers were interdependent: they, as a group, had important ties to school-wide events, and they were part of a regional, as well as a local, operation. Matters of "organizational climate" can be directly observed in the actual meeting operation and can be decided on the basis of "who works with whom" and "who decides what." In terms of citizen training for students, we are probably safe in assuming that democratic activities and values will operate for students only if they operate for staff as well. Authoritarian relationships between superintendent, principal, and teachers will hardly support equalitarian relationships among teachers and students. But the conceptual and methodological point we wish to emphasize is that the "organizational climate" can be specified in terms of programmed operations. It can even be quantified; for example, one could determine how much teacher time is spent in synomorphs where group sharing and group decision making are the dominant patterns of action.

The teacher's meeting refers to matters of power: Who has it? How widely is it shared? The pit assembly refers to another dimension relevant to citizen training: a sense of community or social connectedness. Although motives of interest in or of caring about the others in one's social arena do not establish citizenship behaviors, these motives would seem essential for such behaviors to occur. Only those who care about others are likely to exhibit the restraints and the social efforts that productive citizenship requires.

Whether or not young human beings develop these social feelings would seem to depend on how frequently and how intensely the ecological structures, the synomorphs they inhabit, have togetherness and interdependence as a part of the program. The nonsense song-with-gesture in the pit calls upon all participants to join their verbal and motoric behaviors, to actively share a play form. The exchange of looks and grins--responses to the program environment--indicated that the overt, independent, ecological provisions had successfully elicited psychological reactions of mutuality. A nonpsychological part of a synomorph program had yielded a psychological sense of togetherness.

Another aspect of citizen training would probably include an appreciation of privacy--one's own and that of others. The reading program encouraged all to choose their own reading material and to pursue it; to suspend attention to teachers or peers, and to follow something not in the immediate situation, something requiring one's own thought and imagery to appreciate. Taken together, the assembly and the reading period seem to say: "Being both a congregate person and a private person—and helping others to be the same--is a good way to be."

The idea of balance between interest in social connectedness and concern for privacy points to the larger concern of how to conceive and represent the whole of a classroom or a school's operation. Since synomorphs encompass arrays of objects, persons, and behaviors into bounded units, and since they are ubiquitous (behavior is occurring in one synomorph or another all of the time), these units can be used to map classroom days (Gump, 1974). Or, if larger ecological units are employed (such as behavior settings), they can be used to map an entire school's operation (Barker & Gump, 1964).

Once a comprehensive set of units is employed to describe a school environment, one can describe each unit along dimensions of interest and its duration or its occupancy time and learn the extent to which particular qualities pervade the total environment. For example, in six relatively traditional third grade classrooms, students inhabited interdependent small group environments for only 11% of their school time; on the other hand, completely noninterdependent or "privacy-requiring" synomorphs took up 33% of the pupils' time (Gump, 1967). Another dimension (degree of activity required) showed that synomorphs asking for attention only, or attention and sedentary tasks required about 70% of student time; those requiring active, doing modes (making things, music, games) took about 23%. The proportions or balances of environmental emphases on other dimensions can be measured. One could ask, for example, how much occupancy time is spent in synomorphs which operate with students in positions of some power and responsibility. One study of four elementary schools, two of which were presumably "open" revealed that occupancy time in student-led synomorphs was minuscule (Gump, 1974).

Regardless of the form taken by citizen education in schools, it will be necessary to learn more than how often synomorphs with a citizen training label operate. Synomorphs with curricular labels such as "arithmetic" or "language arts," when their formats are examined, can be seen to offer little or much student interchange, and frequent or rare opportunities for student decision making and exercise of power. Measurement of such qualities and their balance in the total school environmental operation becomes possible with the use of environmental units such as classroom synomorphs or school behavior settings.

In ecological psychology, we have endeavored to learn what we can by observation, measurement, and conceptualization of naturally occurring phenomena. We have not intervened to create synomorphs which manifest presumably positive qualities. Clearly, this kind of engineering of the educational environment needs to be done, and is being done. Educators are introducing milieu changes (e.g., open design schools), human component changes (main streaming), and program changes (curricular games).

Research efforts which introduce synomorph programs designed to improve children's social relationships are being published with increasing frequency. For example, the recent text, Social Psychology of Education (Bar-Tal & Saxe, 1978) provides a number of chapters devoted to attempts to manipulate pupil-pupil and teacher-pupil action relationships and thereby improve both academic learning and the feelings children develop toward one another and themselves. Another recent reference in this general area is the Fall, 1978, issue of the Journal of Research and Development which bears the title, "Social Interdependence in the Classroom: Cooperation, Competition, and Individualism."

From the point of view of citizen training, the development of young people who have positive feelings toward themselves and toward one another is essential. Children who really believe that "looking out for number one" is the only feasible motivation in society will probably exhibit limited citizen behavior. (The issue of prosocial behavior in children has been thoroughly explained in another RBS document; see Staub, 1978.) Those students who have suffered repeated defeats in competitively arranged school synomorphs--the "losers"--may not be predisposed to support the out-of-school settings. A final problem relates more to learning than to motivation. There are situations in which cooperative effort is, realistically, more efficient than individualistic or competitive effort. It is to be hoped that students in an exemplary school environment might learn how to identify such situations and how to operate successfully within them.

If one examines the many studies on cooperation in the classroom, what does one learn about the meaning of cooperation, the effects it may produce, and what arrangements, formats, and program conditions can be involved in establishing classroom cooperation?

A simple conception of cooperation deals with rewards; a situation is cooperative when rewards are shared, but competitive when one person's reward requires another person's loss. Although the word "rewards" here could refer to psychological gain during the program operation, (the reward of sharing ideas, for example), the practice has been to emphasize outcome rewards. A thorough analysis of various outcome reward arrangements has been developed by McClintock (1978). While examination of outcome rewards would seem essential and while it does lend itself to neat analyses, I should like to turn attention to "rewards," or lack of them, in the process of synomorph operation. The general position taken is that these in-process events are also very important. Setting arrangements which arrange for shared end results but which provide little interdependent action prior to the outcome would seem relatively weak contexts for developing cooperative benefits.

For our purposes here, let us leave aside outcome analysis and consider what can happen in the settings designed to maximize cooperation. If we examine the "jig-saw" format proposed by Aronson, we can appreciate the importance of in-process activities and their implicit rewards for cooperative classroom synomorphs (Aronson, Blaney, Stephan, Sikes, & Snapp, 1978).

Briefly, the jig-saw approach involves four action structures over time:

1. The Learning Group: First Meeting. The class is divided into groups of five or six students each. Each member in each group will become responsible for learning about and for teaching fellow group members

about his or her section of the material. For example, the lesson might be the life of Eleanor Roosevelt and each member is to become the teacher for one phase of that life. After each member receives the pertinent assignment and after looking over the material, the second phase of jig-saw is established.

2. The Counterpart Group. All students from each group who, for example, are to teach Eleanor Roosevelt's early life meet in one countergroup; those who were assigned her years in the White House in another countergroup, and so on. The job of the countergroup is to prepare members successfully to teach others in their learning group. By emotional support and cognitive exchange, members clarify and strengthen one another for this next crucial step.

3. The Learning Group: Second Meeting. Reassembled in their original groups, students now fit their piece of the Eleanor Roosevelt jig-saw puzzle into the larger picture. Each shares with others what he or she has learned. An important aspect of the arrangement is the monopoly members hold on their respective materials and information. In any one learning group, only one child has the information on Mrs. Roosevelt's White House Years; if others are to learn about this piece of the lesson, they must learn from that child.

4. Later Quiz or Teacher Check on Individuals' Understanding. Students are later tested or otherwise measured on their comprehension of the lesson. Clearly their success is heavily dependent on the adequacy of their fellow-members' presentations.

Results from the jig-saw method (Aronson, Bridgeman, & Geffner, 1978) have been encouraging. Learning achievements were improved--at least for ethnic subgroups who were repeated losers in traditional classrooms. Further, attitudinal comparisons clearly favored the jig-saw as opposed to the control groups. Pupils from the jig-saw experience became more positive about their own academic ability; they felt closer to peers in their groups, even when those peers were of a different ethnic group, and they expressed more favorable attitudes toward school. Of importance to Aronson was the fact that the jig-saw participants were learning cooperative skills and attitudes which, it was hoped, would survive when the children were in competitive situations.

The hopes for cooperative formats in school are very relevant to the development of individuals who can appreciate the values important in citizenship in a more humane future society. The jigsaw researchers express this idea well.

> For most American children, reared as they are on a fairly steady diet of competitiveness, the strategy seems to be: When in doubt, go out there and beat the other person. Frankly our ultimate goal is for children to begin to learn that cooperation is appropriate, functional, exciting, and humanizing in many more situations than they might have realized. It is even conceivable that as more and more children begin to experience some systematic cooperation as part of their educational experience and social development, then perhaps the values of society might shift away from the relentless concern with winning that currently pervades it. As has been shown, high standards and good performance are not necessarily incompatible with support, friendship, empathy and tolerance for individual differences. (Aronson, Bridgeman, & Geffner, 1978, p.26)

With the specific operations of jig-saw synomorphs before us, and with the evidence of results of significant value that have been achieved, we might ask about the variables behind the obtained results. The researchers emphasize the ideas of Mead and Piaget as they relate to role taking and the expanded social view that flexible role taking enables (Aronson, et al., 1978, p. 24). Our own interpretation, while not contradicting the views of these authors, would place the emphasis a little differently. Consider the usual experience of, say, a lower class Mexican-American child in an integrated but otherwise traditional classroom. Not only do these children "lose" many academic encounters; they also have no valuable function in the typical academic settings. But when they become specialists in one period of Mrs. Roosevelt's life, they become individuals with function. The importance of having a function in a setting has been discussed by Barker and Gump (1964). If one has no function of importance, others may ask "What kind of person is with us?" Attributes of dress, skin color, and personal mannerism become important. But when a person has function, the questions are, "Is the function being performed? Is the job coming off?" If it is an important job, the person takes on the value of that achievement no matter "what kind of person" he or she is. (Recall that in the jig-saw arrangement, each child possessed a monopoly on his or her information. Each was, in ecological not just psychological terms, important; each child had an essential function.) Operating with function also effects how one views oneself. Without function, the question of "What kind of a person am I?"

becomes related to egocentric evaluations. With important functions, the question shifts from "What kind of a person am I?" to the more objective interest "What am I getting done?" And if one is getting done things valued by others and oneself, one becomes more valuable. This self-esteem can occur somewhat regardless of variety of positive and negative personal characteristics.

I have selected the jig-saw example from an extensive literature on social interdependence in the classroom. I want to recognize that investigators such as Johnson and Johnson (1978), DeVries and Slavin (1978), Buckholdt and Wodarski (1978), and Weigel, Wiser, and Cook (1975) have developed classroom formats to increase cooperative action and shared rewards. Some of these formats involve straight cooperation while others require within-group or team cooperation but between-team competition. Basic to most of these arrangements is an increase of individual function. The analyses emphasize the reward systems, but examination of what is actually done will show that the performances of individual children become significant and valuable to other children. A major function is that of tutor; the child changes from a kind of passive educational "customer" to an educational performer or operative. In ecological psychology, we have developed considerable evidence that this change from mere customer or member to operator or functionary brings along with it a number of other changes relevant to social values and relevant to citizenship. It is to this evidence I wish to now turn.

When children enter high school, a whole new cluster of synomorphs or behavior settings becomes available. Often labeled "extracurricular" or "cocurricular" activities, these settings provide both consumer and functionary roles in athletics, dramatics, journalism, politics, social service, and partying.

The ecological weight of these settings in the total high school environment can be quite impressive. Our own investigation of small and large schools showed that extracurricular settings accounted for about one half of all the settings in the small school (150 students); if athletic settings, which are sometimes physical education classes and other times are extraclass events, are included the percentage rises to 70%. Large schools (1000+ students) showed almost 50% of the settings were extracurricular and if athletics are added, the amount rises to 60%.

In terms of psychological significance to students, our data would also show that students experienced quite significant perceptions and feelings in their extracurricular activities; more of this later. The point for now is that the extracurricular school arena has considerable ecological weight and psychological consequence.

The nature of this realm of school environment differs in important ways from the academic settings of the elementary classroom. The extracurricular settings manifest the following:

1. Rewards are less clearly outcome and more likely in-process.
2. When rewards are of the outcome type, they are based on perceptions of successful projects and affairs, not on points or grades.
3. Much student cooperation is required, in the very nature of

settings and their mission. No special definitions or arrangements are required to establish a cooperative structure; putting out a newspaper or putting on a musical manifestly requires the integration of many volunteers and their efforts.

4. Many responsible roles or functions must be assumed by students if the extracurricular settings are to operate successfully. In the academic setting of elementary school, social interdependency arrangements such as the jig-saw yield special formats which increased the number of functionaries. In the extracurricular high school settings, these many functionary slots exist naturally. To publish a school annual, some students must become salesmen of advertising space, others will be photographers, and still others will be layout experts and editors.

In this high school arena, the reality is such that functionary positions _must_ be filled by students. Teachers and staff do not just choose to have it so; if there is to be a flourishing extracurricular program, staff cannot provide sufficient middle level leadership to support it. Student responsibility becomes not an ideological aspiration, but an ecological necessity.

The extent to which students actually become functionaries in the extracurricular realm is very much related to school size. In ecological psychology we have developed a theory of undermanning pertinent to the issue of activities and experiences of individuals in institutions (such as school) and communities. This theory is thoroughly described by Roger

Barker (1968) and updated by research and conceptual development accomplished by Alan Wicker (1979). I want to describe just enough here to clarify the importance of function for children and youth in school. The theory for high schools may be sketched as follows:

1. As high schools become larger, their student population increases more rapidly than the extracurricular settings available to them.

   Data: In Eastern Kansas, from the smallest school to the largest, population increased 65 times but setting increased only 8 fold.

2. As schools become larger, the number of people available per setting also becomes larger.

   Data: The average number of juniors available per extracurricular setting in a group of small high schools was .5, in a large school, 4.0.

3. When there are more people available per setting, there are fewer (forces) pressures and invitations on any one to take on responsible functions with the result that . . .

4. Students in larger schools engage in fewer responsible extracurricular roles (are less often in functionary positions) than students in small schools.

   Data: From September to December, junior students in a large high school had responsible functions in an average of 3.5 settings; students in four small schools, in 8.6 settings. Further, 29% of the large school students were never in a functionary position in that four-month period; only 2% of the small school persons never experienced a functionary role.

5. Because experience in settings is very much influenced by position in the setting, large school students will report extracurricular satisfactions different from those of small school students. Large school students will also report different pressures and invitations for participation in settings.

   Data: Large school participants typically report satisfactions in: vicarious competitions, excitement and affiliation with large groups. Small school students report more satisfactions dealing with: expanded competence, challenges, big jobs or tough competitions, being valued and supported by others, and being part of a small action group (a team, or a cast for a play).

In terms of actual quotations, large school students were more likely to say that they found a particular setting, and their participation in it worthwhile because:

"The fall elections have excitement to them."

"I like to watch a hard-fought game."

"I like the companionship of mingling with the crowd."

Small school students might say:

"It (Junior Class Play) gave me more confidence."

"This (Junior Class Magazine Sale) gave me a chance to see whether or not I am a good salesman. I now believe that I am."

"It (Homecoming Parade) also gave me recognition among the people and students at the school."

"During the class play practice, the class worked together as a group and I enjoyed that very much."

Clearly, the satisfaction, the rewards of students in the small schools' extracurricular arena were of a different quality than those of the large school students. Why these differences? Is it just that, like the title of the book, Small is Beautiful? The issue can be examined shortly; one more set of data is important in understanding the psychological effects of the small and large schools.

One of the criticisms of the competition structures common in classrooms is that they produce children who suffer repeated loss in the competition, who reactively assume an apathetic approach to school, and who fail even more certainly because of this attitude. A group of "losers" in the academic game is thus established in the schools.

Such losers may or may not experience success and inclusion in the extracurricular game. Willems (1967) investigated youth whose I.Q., academic, and family backgrounds gave them only a marginal probability of success in school courses; he also studied a comparison group of students without significant academic disadvantages. He labeled these groups marginal and regular and he examined their attitude to extracurricular events in both large and small schools. Basically, Willems asked all students, "What, if any, were for you real reasons for, or pulls toward, attending various extracurricular activities?" Willems discovered that, overall, small school students reported significantly more pulls to activities than students in the large schools. Especially interesting were the findings for the marginal students. These disadvantaged youth in large schools reported significantly less pulls than did regular large school students; however, in the small school, marginal students reported just as many pulls to participation as did regular ones. Commitment to school affairs was most precisely measured by a count of "responsibility answers." Students would sometimes report that reasons for participation were: "I should go to support my class." Or "I had a responsibility for the party." Both small school regulars and small school marginals reported over five such obligation answers; large school regulars reported about three and large school marginals less than one. It was painfully clear that if academically marginal students attended a large school they felt marginal to the school's social events. However, the same type of students in a small school did not feel marginal; on the contrary, they experienced as many pulls, as many tugs of responsibility, as did their regular counterparts.

The data reported here have proved quite robust; many of the findings have been replicated (Wicker, 1968, 1979; Willems, 1967). Several things are established: students in larger schools, on the average, experience more vicarious satisfactions and fewer satisfactions relating to challenge, competition, and being valued and supported. Further, large schools exert a weaker claim on their students than do small schools; alienation of marginal students seems relatively absent in the small schools and severe in the large ones.

Now we wish to return to the more basic question of why such behavioral and experiential differences should occur. The small school obtains its results because its extracurricular arena is undermanned. This undermanning means that there is more pressure and invitation on available students to take over important functions. Once the small school students engage in important functions, they perceive the situation as needing them; they feel valued and important in the situation. An internal analysis of the data demonstrated that the opportunity to have function was indeed the major cause of the big school and small school differences. For example, students in the big school who exercised functions in settings reported satisfactions quite similar to those of small school students. Or, in a parallel analysis, when the individuals in both size schools participated in both nonfunctionary and functionary positions, it was found that the nonfunctionary pattern of satisfactions differed from the functionary one in a fashion similar to overall small and large school differences. Willems' results on responsibility rest on the fact that marginal students in the small schools occupied functionary positions while such students in large schools did not. Both ecological theory and data push us to the conclusion that pressure leading to significant function is the key variable underlying engaging in such function and in experiencing the kind of satisfactions and commitments described above. This is not to say that size is not important; it is to describe the way size works. Putting it over-simply, large size--if not countered in some way--will make some people redundant. Often these people are the less favored: the marginal, the young, the old, the handicapped, or the "different." When there are many enterprises requiring many persons in functionary positions, these people are used and their limitations or differences fade in comparison to their contribution.

Throughout this paper, attention has been directed to the school synomorphs or settings young people occupy and to the effects different settings, and different roles in settings, might have upon the young inhabitants. Specific, measureable milieu and program qualities can produce inter- and intrapersonal effects which seem pertinent to citizen training. It is presumed that school synomorphs, engineered so that participants come to feel their own worth and the worth of others, are beneficial beginnings to future citizenship. Further, it is assumed that a commitment to the events and affairs of school--the predominant beyond-the-home societal institution for the young--provides better citizen experience than alienation from that institution.

We would like, finally, to point to a further value inherent in taking responsible part in a variety of school settings. This point has more to do with ecological learning than with the feelings of worth or caring emphasized thus far.

The learning of importance here relates to setting operation and even setting creation. Although, we have no research to test this idea, it is easy to believe that when students help "run things," they are learning "how things run." The quality of modern life will depend upon the vigor and responsiveness of many types of settings. Competent citizens should know "how things run;" they should have had experience in functionary positions; and they should have faith in their capacity to help a volunteer organization, a political action group, or a community celebration. A rich array of settings with a variety of functionary positions would seem to be an important training ground for citizenship.

Whether this setting array should be limited to the school or include many beyond school is an open question. Coleman and others (1974) have given the matter scholarly and imaginative attention. In any case, what we have seen in schools suggests some possibilities for training citizens who can help maintain and even create settings of benefit to society.

Recent developments in high school environments often show an erosion of those very settings which might yield the social interaction, the proschool feeling and the exercise of responsibility that enhances citizen education. Reporting on a large, recently integrated high school, Scherer and Slawski (1978) show how both the design features supposedly leading to improvements in the quality of student life and the traditional extraclass social settings were abandoned. The key to school management became control, not beneficial and pleasureable activity settings. In the name of control, the lunch hour was eliminated, an auxiliary gym closed, the spacious media center divided into more superviseable spaces, the auditorium locked up, transit in and out of classrooms and through hallways tightly supervised and entry into and out of the building made difficult by locked doors and a pass system. The authors deny that this situation is unique; such a "retreat to control" may be quite common. Instead of inviting youth to exercise responsibility in a relatively open school environment, we are eliminating those ecological niches where such responsibility is required. We are taking away functions instead of enlarging them.

Young people need functions in settings partly just to learn what is involved in successful setting operation. They need to have settings depend on their efforts; they need occasionally to see that without their efforts, settings can deteriorate or even die.

Further, the learning about settings and roles within them needs to be graduated in difficulty. There are positions which can be easily understood. The role of advertising solicitor for the high school annual is often modeled by an older student to an accompanying younger one. Many extracurricular settings continue year after year so that incoming generations slip easily into positions vacated by preceding ones.

More difficult is the reform of dysfunctional settings, and even more challenging is the creation of new settings. One would hope that these latter experiences could also be engineered for the young.

Much of the research on certain school settings has centered on academic benefits and on psychological or feeling rewards. But the learning of how useful settings are created, maintained, and used for the benefit of self and others ought to be another target of research. Perhaps a future day will see a science of "setting-learning;" it might be a fruitful study.

REFERENCES

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, M. The jig-saw classroom. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1978.

Aronson, Elliot, Bridgeman, Diane L., & Geffner, Robert. Interdependent interactions and pro-social behavior. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1978, 12 (1), 16-27.

Bar-Tal, D., & Saxe, L. (Eds.). Social psychology of education. New York: Wiley, 1978.

Barker, Roger G. Ecological psychology: Concepts and methods for studying the environment of human behavior. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1968.

Barker, Roger G., & Gump, P. V. Big school, small school. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Buckholdt, D. R., & Wodarski, J. S. The effects of different reinforcement systems on cooperative behavior in the classroom contexts. Journal of Research and Development, 1978, 12 (1), 50-68.

Coleman, J. S. and others. Youth in transition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Conant, E. Teacher and paraprofessional work productivity: A public school cost-effectiveness study. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath Co., 1973.

DeVries, D. L., & Slavin, R. E. Teams-games-tournaments (TGT): Review of ten classroom experiments. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1978, 12 (1), 28-38.

Gump, P. V. The classroom behavior setting: Its nature and relation to student behavior. U. S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Branch, Project NO. 5-0334, Final Report; 1967.

Gump, P. V. Operating environments in open and traditional schools. School Review, 1974, 84, 575-593.

Gump, P. V. Education as an environmental enterprise. In R. Wineberg and F. Wood (Eds.), Observation of pupils and teachers in mainstream and special education settings: Alternative strategies. Minneapolis, Minn.: Leadership Training Institute/Special Education University of Minnesota, 1975.

Hill, R. A. *Citizen education: A working definition*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1978.

Jackson, P. *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1978, *12* (1), 3-15.

McClintock, C. G. Social values: Their definition, measurement, and development. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1978, *12* (1), 121-137.

Moos, R. H. *Evaluating educational environments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Scherer, J., & Slawski, E. J. Desegregation and school space. *Integrated Education*, 1978, *16* (6), 38-44.

Schumacher, E. F. *Small is beautiful*. London: Blond & Briggs, 1973.

Staub, E. *Prosocial theorists approach to moral citizenship education*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1976.

Weigel, R. H., Wiser, P. L., & Cook, S. W. The impact of cooperative learning experience on cross-ethnic relations and attitudes. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1975, *31*, 219-244.

Wicker, A. W. Undermanning, performances, and students' subjective experiences in behavior settings of large and small high schools. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1968, *10*, 255-261.

Wicker, A. W. *An introduction to ecological psychology.* Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1979.

Willems, E. P. Sense of obligation to high school activities as related to school size and marginality of student. *Child Development*, 1967, *38*, 1247-1260.

INTRODUCTION TO COMMENTARIES ON POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Joseph J. D'Amico, Field Specialist
Citizen Education, Research for Better Schools, Inc.

The effect of school governance and classroom climate on the political socialization of children has been studied from a number of perspectives. In re-examining three classic perspectives and outlining some salient issues in school and classroom governance associated with each, Judith Gillespie and Mary Soley provide a useful framework to help practitioners understand the complex phenomena of political socialization. In addition, they alert practitioners to some specific difficulties in adopting any one perspective exclusively. They suggest that an integrated, ecological approach to understanding children's political learning is necessary in order to minimize the effects that adoption problems have on the efforts of practitioners. They believe that applying such an ecological approach when examining school and classroom environments will enable educators to make more effective, useful changes. In the following responses, Murry Nelson of the Pennsylvania State University and Nancy Wyner of Wheelock College reaffirm the need for this kind of integration and offer additional considerations for Gillespie and Soley's ecological approach.

Pointing to other disparate fields which have successfully adopted an ecological approach, Murry Nelson predicts that "educology" may well play an important role in relating children to schooling. However, he raises what he believes are three other important considerations for those pursuing an ecological approach: philosophy, culture, and change. Nelson suggests that a truly integrative approach to political socialization should address issues of educational philosophy as practiced by school personnel, political enculturation as it occurs both in and out of school, such as pursued in cultural anthropology, and social change as it affects both the individual and the institution.

Nancy Wyner also views an ecological approach as a potentially valuable analytic tool. Like Nelson, she would like to see it broadened so that it will be of greater benefit to those whose responsibility it is to plan governance learning for children. Specifically, Wyner would like an ecological approach to explore social development in greater depth. She believes such concepts as social cognition, perspective taking, and developmental interaction are crucial issues to be investigated and understood. She recommends that Gillespie and Soley's ecological approach be expanded to address these considerations and include an examination of the part that children's earliest experiences with governance and institutional climates play in their political socialization.

Lee Ehman provides an historical view of citizenship education, particularly focused through an examination of research in political socialization. He addresses the affective concerns of classroom climate and the methodology of instruction that research suggests is effective in serving these concerns. Ehman draws a distinction between knowledge and attitudinal outcomes. He discusses organizational aspects of classroom climate and issues such as freedom of expression and toleration of various points of view. By and large, Ehman offers in-depth suggestions for many of Gillespie and Soley's ideas in their ecological approach. However, he also suggests it will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve both knowledge and attitudinal gains by means of simultaneous instruction.

REFLECTIONS ON
SOCIALIZATION PERSPECTIVES FOR SCHOOL
GOVERNANCE AND CLASSROOM CLIMATES

Murry Nelson

The Pennsylvania State University

Judith Gillespie and Mary Soley have admirably summed up the current status of political socialization as it relates to school governance and classroom climate. By examining carefully their synthesis one is struck by a number of matters. First is the relative flimsiness of political socialization research. Many studies have never been replicated, many studies have been inconclusive, and some studies have been repeated with contradictory results.

Second is the very limited discussion of two concepts that demand much fuller attention across all three approaches--change and the media. Despite Gillespie and Soley consigning these ideas to only one approach each, their impact is clearly broader in scope.

A third point that warrants notice is Gillespie and Soley's idea of combining viewpoints in their ecological approach to political socialization. Their tripartite division of the various studies should be seen for what it truly is--a heuristic attempt to classify diverse examinations of socialization, none of which could totally exclude any of the three identified perspectives.

A fourth point that I feel should be considered is the whole nature of socialization itself. Can it be studied without commensurate study of enculturation and the broader context within which they both lie?

Before returning to these issues I should note the very positive impact that the Gillespie-Soley paper made on my thinking. The authors clearly synthesized thinking in the field, noted implications for research and also noted the void that is present in each approach. In a manner reminiscent of a legal brief, they then fill the breach with their version of the best way to study the political socialization of Susie.

Some of the excellent points that they make, often in passing, certainly warrant further emphasis. One of their most important points concerns the decisions that teachers and administrators make to improve quality education. As Gillespie and Soley note, "their perception of what is quality education could vary depending upon the particular socialization approach that they (the teacher or administrator) used." Unless this is known and understood clearly, all the models that we create and recreate will be of little use. Again, Gillespie and Soley are well aware of this. They remark that, "In terms of practice, the study indicates that sheer awareness of socialization processes by school personnel is important. Once awareness is created, however, it is important to see socialization not as a static phenomenon, but rather as a dynamic one." This is much harder to put into practice than it is to perceive. One way to do this might be to encourage school personnel to recognize and clarify educational philosophies as they relate to the school curriculum and then to see the approaches of Gillespie and Soley as extensions of those philosophies. Most school personnel do not have a well-articulated philosophy toward the curriculum and the school. A knowledge of various curricular postures could lead naturally to philosophical approaches to political socialization.

Gillespie and Soley's approaches might be seen as extended analogies then of experimentalism, social reconstructionism, and essentialism (Tanner & Tanner, 1975). The developmental perspective would clearly relate most easily to experimentalism which encourages reflective thinking for social problem solving and growth. The difference between this thrust and a development that is totally asocial is neatly summed up by Tanner and Tanner (1975), "As Dewey observed, when personal fulfillment is severed from intellectual activity, 'freedom of self-expression turns into something that might better be called self-exposure'" (p. 17). School personnel must be aware of the social contracts implied in a developmental perspective and not see it as a narcissistic enterprise. By recognizing their goal of schooling to be reflective thinking, they can more easily understand how a political socialization approach follows from that.

An agents' approach would seem to rely more on the idea of reconstructionism whereby a critical analysis of societal flaws and programmatic needs for corrective action are offered. The roots of essentialism would also be utilized here as they relate to the basic tenets of the social sciences that impact upon the curriculum. If one sees these philosophical approaches to the curriculum and schooling as similar to one's own, then an agent approach would seem consonant with that.

Finally, a systems approach would seem to be also rooted in social reconstruction but with a more technological undercurrent which resembles the analytic style of Orlosky and Smith. With these philosophies familiar, an understanding of the approaches to political socialization might be more easily accomplished. Following that, one is then free to reorder those approaches, and the result might indeed look like the ecological approach of Gillespie and Soley.

The ecological approach is not unwarranted in this examination of political socialization by schools and other agents. Other seemingly disparate fields have been wedded with ecology to form new experimental approaches and there is no reason to believe that education cannot also be part of such a marriage. For example, Paolo Soleri has combined his architectural designs with an extreme concern for environmental issues to form the new and experimental field of archology. In a similar vein, education might expand and deepen its scope as it relates to important issues of school environment. The field of "educology" may well be an important factor in how schooling relates to youngsters. In addition, it would incorporate thrusts that Gillespie and Soley voice concern for, namely what roles churches, places of work and other community agencies play in the overall socialization process. Essentially what Gillespie and Soley advocate is a true holistic approach--no earth-shattering proposal in theory, but a very unique step in practice for schools.

In many ways the ecological approach resembles and draws its methodology from the ethnographic approach education has borrowed from anthropology. The focus on individuals and their development as well as the harmonious or discordant nature of schools and communities has been of concern to cultural anthropologists for many years. The cultural borrowing of educators of anthropologic methods can only broaden and strengthen the understanding we have of political awareness of our children. This concern with method, however, is important.

Advocating such an ecological approach implies again that most school personnel and/or researchers have the prerequisite skills to gather, analyze and draw conclusions from the universe of available data. That is simply not true. Most good school ethnographies have been done by or with anthropologists. That fact does not preclude educators from such a task, however. Alan Peshkin's Growing Up American is a fine example of an educator who has used an ethnographic (or for our purposes, ecological) approach to the broad concern of schooling and socialization. It was clearly a long, arduous (albeit enjoyable) task, but the results were rewarding. (It should be noted that Peshkin had studied comparative modes of education and schooling in other countries and considered his study in the light of that experience.) The point I am trying to make is that educators can do as Cillespie and Soley propose, but it is not easy and it is very time-consuming.

Cultural problems that evolve from the research may not be understood or handled adequately. For example, Gillespie and Soley note that they are doing "bottom up" research by interviewing students to determine what students see as needs in school. This may seem a noble goal but how does it square with the cultural background of the students and their families? It may be that what the researchers are doing is to undermine the strength of a culture in the way it operates. The result of the ethnographic research, however, seems to be a much more conclusive picture of the process of events and individual interaction on those events.

This anthropologic perspective puts the whole process of socialization in a different light and may mean that political enculturation, a broader concept, is really what Gillespie and Soley are concerned with. Socialization focuses on learning what is guided primarily by group norms and expectations. Enculturation is similar but involves more familiar and often more informal learning patterns and processes. The way youths are enculturated and, with growing political concept-borrowing, acculturated may be as appropriate for study as socialization.

Earlier in these comments I mentioned that more attention should be paid to social change and political socialization. Gillespie and Soley deal with it only from the systems point of view, but the very idea of socialization implies a change, a shaping to societally proper courses of thinking and action. How one approach changes is another issue that will affect socialization. Appelbaum (1970) presents four diverse theories of social change. In order to make choices to politically socialize, theories of change must also be grasped.

My remarks have in a way skirted the issue of the Gillespie/Soley paper. The authors of that paper have presented a model based on existing research and their own theoretical constructs, and for this they should be lauded highly. It should be noted, however, that their choices require adequate preparation and understanding of anthropological perspectives and overriding theories of social change. In addition, school personnel might be well advised to find a philosophical frame for their ideas of schooling before attempting to make inferential leaps into political socialization. As Gillespie and Soley note, research from all approaches has been inconclusive and there are many research questions that remain unanswered. The ecological approach may indeed be the best approach to examining political socialization, but at this juncture there is no way that other approaches can be categorically rejected.

References

Applebaum, Richard P. *Theories of social change*. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1970.

Orlosky, D. & Smith, B. O. *Curriculum development: Issues and insights*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978.

Peshkin, Alan. *Growing up American*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Tanner, D. & Tanner, L. *Curriculum development*. New York: MacMillan, 1975.

RESPONSE TO

SOCIALIZATION PERSPECTIVES FOR SCHOOL GOVERNANCE AND CLASSROOM CLIMATES

Nancy B. Wyner

Wheelock College

"Socialization Perspectives for School Governance and Classroom Climates" by Judith Gillespie and Mary Soley provides a map of recent research in the terrain of socialization. Although there are forthright indicators that the cartographers' work is incomplete, the explorations are intriguing.

Authors Gillespie and Soley explore three perspectives within the socialization field that help in examining socialization processes: the developmental approach, an approach focused on socialization agents, and the democratic systems approach. Following a review of these perspectives, the authors propose an ecological approach that intends to combine perspectives across various, almost arbitrary, divisions. Their proposal moves to interpret the dynamic, interactive nature of socialization and offers a highly responsible challenge to the validity of much research that builds on false dichotomies and unnatural divisions.

As analytic tools, the perspectives examined by the authors move us closer to the issues and events involved in socialization processes. Complexities and contradictions that elude interpretation in any single focus make us even more mindful of the immensity of the problems we are considering and the inadequacy of present ways to analyze interactions.

In the Gillespie/Soley discussion of the developmental approach, an accounting of emerging theories in social development is missing. As presented, the emphasis is on the individual; significant research in social cognition, social perspective taking and the growing child's knowledge and understanding of social institutions is surprisingly overlooked (Furth, 1979; Selman, 1975, 1977). A more balanced portrait should also include the developmental interaction viewpoint formulated by Barbara Biber and colleagues (Biber & Shapiro, 1972). Knowledge of Biber's ideas enlivens our efforts to understand classroom governance and school climate particularly in focusing on growth as a transactional process. From this viewpoint, the child is seen as an active information processor interacting within his or her social/physical environment.

Gillespie and Soley propose that "people who follow the developmental approach will focus on students as individuals within schools. Governance will be determined in order to influence students' developmental patterns." Recent research in social development and the encompassing ideas proposed by the developmental interaction position press us to move beyond the dualism of individual and social groups. An inclusive view builds strongly on acceptance of social interactions--governance learning and prosocial behaviors--as social experiences that nourish cognition. These ideas link to the Piagetian notion regarding the social milieu of mutuality indicated by respectful teacher-child interactions. Such relationships tend to emphasize cooperation and provide a climate that promotes reasoned interpersonal responses, thus increasing the capacity for differentiation and awareness of concern for others.

In sketching out the developmental perspective, mention must also be made of research that substantiates the qualitatively unique mental capabilities of children younger than age seven or eight. This distinct emphasis is particularly important in relation to the child's construction of a governance concept, for rules specifically. From a Piagetian view, the communication of rules and the quality of adult intervention in developing, conveying and enforcing rules are critical psychological and moral starting points for the child's attitudes about authority and justice--key elements in any plan for school governance.

Essentially, the concern raised above is for a fuller, more comprehensive accounting of the developmental approach. The author's discussion of other approaches raise other points for reflection. The section of this paper on socialization agents has particular immediacy and provides an alternative way of examining the interplay of students' schools, families and communities in relation to political, social learning.

The socialization agents approach calls for widening the concept of education to include citizen agencies--media, business, law enforcement, for example--recognizing these representatives of the community as adult socializers involved in the schooling of students becoming citizens.

One of the problematic aspects of the socialization agent's role in the modeling process is an out of focus view of ourselves as socializing agents, adults who are actively modeling, influencing, and contributing to student's perceptions about the political/legal system. In this crucial interaction of teaching and learning, educators often do not think about children's perceptions of authority, the use of power, the management of conflict, or other related matters.

The very isolation of the classroom from community life perpetuates a pervasive myth and maintains another false dichotomy--that educational and political environments, like work and play, do not mix. Our alternative is to search for interrelationships as powerful conceptual patterns that can guide citizen development and help us in our dialogues about schooling in democracy. Isolation denies interest and involvement. In contrast, the interactions of learners with socializing agents, who incorporate and develop an understanding of the child's growth and development, encourage active experience-based learning and firsthand observation of citizenship tasks. Such interactions hold the potential for impacting the curriculum and changing the political education emphasis from learning idealistic aspirations to observation and investigation of actual behaviors. In addition, they also may bring about increased perceptions of the importance of obligation and responsibility, of governance and prosocial involvement in democracy.

The influence of research on practice must be carefully drawn without losing sight of common sense and the uniqueness of local settings. Proposed schemes for school governance ultimately should respond to learner needs and capabilities. In planning governance learning for young children, aspects of all the approaches might readily contribute to constructing experiences that enhance understandings of democratic processes and values. Careful attention to the active young learner's ways of constructing knowledge are especially important in this cognitively oriented process for learning about the social/political environment.

What does governance look like in the elementary schools? What are the variant patterns that promote prosocial democratic behaviors and political learning? When are children not learning about governance? In the gym when they are playing group games? At classroom meetings that are dominated by an authoritarian teacher or one who only allows the bright or "good" children to share? Or is it when children interact at meeting time, plan learning experiences together, and listen and communicate in a cooperative social context?

There are, according to the authors, a multitude of questions not accounted for by the socialization perspectives--the impact of different governance strategies, the types of participation that matter, key roles individuals might take, and the roles schools play. Indeed, Gillespie and Soley conclude, "we will only know through long-term studies whether student entry into the process of governance has an impact which makes it worth concentrating on in classrooms. The same applies to school governance." What are responsible educators to do in the absence of such evidence?

When we think about the socialization process, school governance issues, and school climate, when we analyze perspectives and summarize these findings, we realize that we are dealing with invisibles, like Socrates' metaphor of the wind. To paraphrase: the winds themselves are invisible, yet what they do is manifest to us and we somehow feel their approach.

At best, we seem to have little in our grasp but perplexities to share with one another. In considering the problems of school governance and classroom climate, perhaps we will conclude that there are no answers--only variations of our questions. Perhaps we will lose the inclination to find solutions and recognize the importance of the search as critical to the teaching and learning process. Practically speaking, each time we are confronted with some new approach, we will have to make up our minds to think to examine anew. We will know more about what we do not know. Then we might ask what--not why. What makes this issue of school governance and classroom climate important to us? Does it have something to do with our intention to remain loyal to the fundamental experience of democracy?

REFERENCES

Biber, B. & Shapiro, E. The education of young children: A developmental-interaction approach. Teachers College Record, 1972, 74(1), pp. 55-79.

Chandler, M. J. Social cognition: A selective review of current research. In W. F. Overton & J. M. McCarthy (Eds.), Knowledge and Development, Vol. I: Advances in Research and Theory. New York: Plenum Press, 1977.

Furth, H. G. How the child understands social institutions. In F. B. Murray (Ed.), The Impact of Piagetian Theory on Education, Philosophy, Psychiatry and Psychology. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press, 1979.

Piaget, J. The right to education in the present world. In To Understand Is to Invent. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973.

Roedell, W. C., Slaby, R. G., & Robinson, H. B. Social development in young children -- A report for teachers. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Institute of Education, January, 1976.

Selman, R. L. A developmental approach to interpersonal and moral awareness in young children: Some theoretical and educational implications of levels of social perspective taking. In J. Meyers, B. Burnham, & J. Colvat (Eds.), Values Education: Theory/Practice/Problems/ Prospects. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975.

Selman, R. L., Jacquette, D., & Lavin, D. R. Interpersonal awareness in children: Toward an integration of developmental and clinical child psychology. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, April, 1977, 47(2), pp. 264-274.

Wyner, N. B. The Cambridge study: Involving citizens in defining citizenship education for children. A research report for the Office of Citizen Education, U. S. Office of Education, Grant No. PO-0770549, February, 1978.

~~102~~
103

POLITICAL EDUCATION RESEARCH AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Lee H. Ehman

Indiana University

Whose job is citizenship education? Until about 1925, it was considered the task of the entire schooling process to socialize youth into citizens. With the advent of a new curriculum pattern, called social studies, citizenship education began to be equated with the goals of this new school subject. At the present time, most would agree that the main purpose of social studies is the development of good citizens.[1] Other prominent writers in the social education field remind us, however, that responsibility for citizenship education goes well beyond one subject area in school, and transcends schooling itself. Many other agencies, from the armed services local institutions such as libraries and police, share this job.[2]

In this paper, however, I will analyze the principal ways in which the schooling process has been shown by researchers to impinge upon citizenship education. This broad research area, labelled "political socialization" research.[3] Findings from political education research have implications for school teachers, especially social studies teachers, and for school administrators and counselors. These implications must be qualified both because of the relatively weak methodology of much research in this area[4] and because of many gaps in the coverage of problems.

Nevertheless, some important generalizations can be stated and implications drawn from the studies conducted on this topic. After reviewing four main themes of citizenship education, we will discuss those generalizations and implications.

Four Traditional Themes of Citizenship Education

The four main themes or desired outcomes, of citizenship education seem to be these: 1) Political loyalty; 2) Political knowledge; 3) Democratic attitudes and values; and 4) Decision-making skills. The first theme, political loyalty, refers to goals such as obedience to laws and political authority, and a sense of duty and loyalty to one's community, state, and country. The second theme follows from Thomas Jefferson's prescription for good citizenship -- learn history. Somewhat expanded, the political knowledge theme suggests that knowing more about history, society, and especially about political institutions, will lead to good citizenship.

The democratic attitudes and values position holds that beliefs are the key to good citizenship. Belief in majority rule and minority rights; tolerance for dissent; belief in political participation; sense of personal political competence -- these are examples of such beliefs. Finally, the fourth theme is that decision-making skills -- the ability to understand social and political problems, to collect and analyze data that bear on these problems, to sort out competing value positions, and finally to make an informed personal decision about the problem -- constitute the most important aspect of good citizenship.

In addition to these mainstream ideas about the desired outcomes of civic education, there are a substantial number of contemporary "interest groups" which clamor for their particular goals. A simple listing will give an idea of their range: Political action skills; Legal education; Moral education; Global education; Economic education; Environmental education; Parenting and family education; Career education; and Multicultural/multiethnic education. Suffice it to say that citizenship education has numerous proponents and positions!

Political education research has by far the most to say about the second and third main themes, political knowledge and democratic attitudes and values. Research ahs been focused on some of the other main and special interest themes, but the findings do not "add up" to an ability to generalize as in the case of knowledge and attitudes. It is to these generalizations, and their implications for teachers and administrators, that we now turn.

Content for Knowledge and Climate for Attitudes

The thesis of this paper is simple: If your goal is to increase political knowledge of students in school, focus on teaching specific, well-developed content, through direct instruction. If, on the other hand, you want to promote democratic values and attitudes, concentrate on school and classroom "climate." Put another way, emphasize what you teach for knowledge outcomes, and for attitudes, how you teach. The two different goals seem to have somewhat separate paths leading to them.

What is school and classroom "climate?" This refers to how things are done in the whole school and in specific classes. Rather than what is done, it is the way in which they are done that is crucial for the "climate" aspects of schooling. How much student involvement there is in school decision making, and how extracurricular activities are conducted, are examples of school climate variables. If students see themselves as involved in school decision making about school rules, for instance, or if they view extracurricular activities as ways in which they can participate meaningfully in school affairs, then we would say there is an "open school climate." Likewise, if in the classroom students consistently have an opportunity to express their opinions on controversial topics, and the teacher is not always dominant, then there is an "open classroom climate." Researchers have found that climate makes a difference in attitudes.

Political Knowledge as Citizenship Education

Before analyzing the "climate" research, however, we will examine political education research findings for knowledge outcomes.

For ten years the work of Langton and Jennings[5] has dominated our knowledge about the impact of civics courses on political knowledge of senior high school students. Using their national sample of seniors in 1965, they showed that a number of civics and history courses taken by these seniors during high school was not related to political knowledge. Several other researchers confirmed this finding with smaller scale studies.[6]

This research had one major problem, however. The test of political knowledge tended to be very perfunctory, often consisting of two or three low-level knowledge questions. A more recent study, based on much more extensive and current national data, and using much more sophisticated and sensitive political knowledge measures, has shown that the number of courses, and the study of specific topics within these courses, are relatively powerful predictors of political knowledge.[7] Based on the most recent (1976) National Assessment for Educational Progress survey data, these conclusions would appear to have more validity than the earlier findings of Langton and Jennings. This is especially true because of the much higher quality of measurement of political knowledge itself. Therefore, one generalization that can be made is that taking more courses, and studying specific content within these courses, does improve political knowledge.

But we can go further than this. The National Assessment findings also show that the use of so-called "direct instruction" *within* these courses also makes a positive difference. Three pedagogical aspects of "direct instruction" were included in the findings. These included the emphasis on and use of a textbook; the use of lectures; and assignment of homework in civics-related courses. Apparently, according to the National Assessment researchers, the more the teacher tries to teach content through these instructional practices, the more knowledge will be gained by students.

Other, more specifically-aimed studies have shown the same thing. For example, Patrick, in his extensive pilot study of the *American Political Behavior* curriculum materials, showed that with a semester-long course in civics having a special focus on political behavior, student knowledge made impressive gains.[8] Attitude change, however, was not found. This was not surprising, as it was knowledge, not attitudes, that was the object of the special materials. Other political education researchers have to come up with findings similar to those of Patrick.[9]

This generalization is interesting in light of the overall knowledge declines shown by the National Assessment from 1972 to 1976. Without describing these declines in detail, suffice it to say that political knowledge has declined significantly for both 13-year-olds and 17-year-olds in such areas as knowledge of constitutional rights, understanding of the structure and function of government, and understanding the political process.[10]

If this decline is real, and there is every reason to believe that it is, then it would appear that there has been a recent decline in either the number of civics courses taken by students, or the amount of direct instructional practices (use of textbooks, lectures, and homework), or a decline in both of these factors. Looking back at the last decade of change in the secondary social studies curriculum, it is not difficult to believe that a decline in both factors has occurred.

The emphasis during the late 1960s and early 1970s on electives rather than required subjects, on a variety of instructional media rather than the single textbook, and on inquiry and discovery rather than exposition and homework, might account for at least part of the political knowledge decline in the early 1970s traced by National Assessment. The implication seems to be that if we de-emphasize knowledge in our classes, knowledge declines, perhaps to the benefit of whatever it is that we emphasize more.

Political Values and Attitudes as Citizenship Education

There are a few examples in the political education research literature of successful attempts to change political values and attitudes through direct instruction aimed at that goal. For instance, Goldenson conducted a three-week field experiment in two high schools that showed quite convincingly that a specific program could change twelfth graders' attitudes toward civil liberties.[11] Other researchers have demonstrated similar, but limited, results for other values and attitudes.[12] However, more studies have shown the opposite -- that a number of courses or specific curriculum units do not have positive attitudinal outcomes. The center of gravity of these studies suggests that more often than not, direct instruction does not change values and attitudes in a desired direction.[13]

Furthermore, there is some solid evidence that direct instruction can have negative impact on attitudes. Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen, in reporting the results from a ten-nation study conducted in the early 1970s, shows that across all countries, such school practices as the use of printed drill materials and stress on factual aspects of subject matter have a negative relationship with attitudes such as tolerance for dissent and a positive relationship with authoritarianism.[14] This may be one example of the trade-off between knowledge and attitude outcomes discussed above. Knowledge gains might be accompanied by negative attitude shifts. Unfortunately, the Torney study did not examine the political knowledge question with enough precision to determine if that was occurring in their research.

To contrast with this rather confusing and ambiguous picture, we now examine the relationships of school and classroom climate factors to student attitudes. The overwhelming conclusion is that open climate in schools is related to positive attitudes of students.[15]

School organizational climate is related to positive attitudes. An organizational climate characterized by reciprocity within the decision-making process, and not by a strictly hierarchical, top-to-bottom decision and communication pattern, is one likely to have students who are more socially trusting and politically interested, and who believe they are politically competent.[16] Participation in extracurricular activities is similarly related to positive political attitudes.

Classroom climate has also been found to be connected to student attitudes.[17] The extent of controversial social and political issues discussion is one aspect of an open climate in the class. This factor is related to positive attitudes such as political confidence and interest, and tolerance of dissent. Another, and related aspect of open classroom climate, is the degree to which students believe that they can express openly their views in classroom settings. Again, related to this, is a third factor -- the extent to which teachers actively encourage a range of viewpoints being considered. Both of these latter two climate attributes have also been linked to positive student attitudes.

For attitudes and values, then, *how* schooling influences student decision-making involvement, and *how* classroom teachers involve the students in considering politically pertinent subject matter, rather than the *content* of this subject matter, is what matters. In light of this interpretation of the "climate" research, it is again interesting to consider what National Assessment has discovered to be the across-time trends in political attitudes of students. From 1969 to 1976, they found that students' sense of being able to influence government increased for national concerns, but decreased for local concerns. Unfortunately, fewer in 1976 than 1969 could explain specific ways of influencing governmental processes.

Tolerance and respect for others' socio-economic and racial differences increased over this time period. This finding may well reflect an increasing concern in the late 1960s and early 1970s with just such attitudes in the school curriculum. It also may signal the effect of less authoritarian teaching practices and open school climates, as suggested above. Whatever the explanations, these attitudinal findings underscore the point made earlier that there may be a curricular trade-off operating. If it is true that there was a major re-emphasis in the social studies curriculum during the period under study, then National Assessment is finding what it should find -- decreased knowledge levels and somewhat more positive attitudes as a result. If the current shift toward basic skills and a beefing up of the knowledge aspects in social studies continues, then the next National Assessment in Citizenship and Social Studies should contain a mirror image of the 1969-1976 change findings.

What Should Teachers and Administrators Do?

When we stand back and take stock of our findings, a few features stand out from the rest. First, what we should do depends upon what our citizenship education goals are. If they center around students' acquisition of political knowledge, then we should use direct instructional practices such as lectures and homework assignments, and textbooks. These should be used in conjunction with specific curriculum objectives geared toward increasing political knowledge.

If, on the other hand, our goals have to do with fostering democratic values and attitudes, then the school and classroom climates appear to be the most powerful levers that we can manipulate. Administrators and counselors should make the school a place in which students have a role in the decision-making and communication processes. They should be encouraged to participate in meaningful extracurriculur activities.

Classroom teachers should engage their students in the discussion of controversial social and political issues, so that students feel able to express their opinions openly. Furhter, the teacher should encourage a range of views in the classroom.

But there is reason to believe that we can't have it both ways. Knowledge or attitudes, not both, it would seem, can be achieved. In achieving success in one area, we may lose ground in the other. The more the instruction is direct and pointed at knowledge outcomes, the less open the classroom climate will tend to be. Perhaps the best we can do is make our choice firmly, one way or the other, and stick with it. There does not seem to be research which suggests an optimistic synthesis which will lead to both goals simultaneously.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies (Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin 51, 1977).

[2] For a complete analysis of this idea, see Richard C. Remy, "Social Studies and Citizenship Education: Elements of a Changing Relationship," Theory and Research in Social Education 6:4 (December, 1978), 40-59.

[3] The term "political education" in this paper is taken to mean that subpart of the political socialization process which constitutes instruction in schools, both direct and indirect, which is aimed at shaping the political attitudes, knowledge and behavior of youth. It is noted that this conception of political education differs somewhat from that of Patrick, who characterizes political socialization as a subset of political education. See John J. Patrick, "Political Socialization and Political Education in Schools," in Stanley A. Renshon, Handbook of Political Socialization: Theory and Research (New York: Free Press, 1977), pp. 190-222.

[4] In forming the generalizations used in this paper two recent reviews were used extensively. Lee H. Ehman, "The American School and the Political Socialization Process," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 50, No. 1, (Spring 1980); Lee H. Ehman, "Research on Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction: Values," in Francis P. Hunkins, Lee H. Ehman, Carole L. Hahn, Peter H. Martorella and Jan L. Tucker, Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975, Bulletin No. 49 (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), pp. 55-96. Several others were consulted. Dean Jaros, Socialization to Politics (New York: Praeger, 1973); John J. Patrick, Political Socialization of American Youth: A Review of Research with Implications for Secondary School Social Studies, Bulletin No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: Nation Council for the Social Studies, 1967); Michael P. Riccards, The Making of the American Citizenry: An Introduction to Political Socialization (New York: Chandler, 1973); and Robert Weissberg, Political Learning, Political Choice, and Democratic Citizenship (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974). The generalizations are based almost exclusively on correlational, not experimental, research. This means that it is not legitimate to draw causal connections, and to assert that changes in one variable cause changes in another. We can only note correlations among variables. If all "non-causal" research findings were excluded from consideration, we would be able to conclude only that some special curriculum treatments, included in the few valid field experiments in the political education literature, can influence political knowledge. This paper is not restricted to such a rigid constraint. Instead, knowledge from valid correlational studies is used. The language of these generalizations and implications is cast in terms of cause and effect; this error is necessary if anything is to be said on the topic.

[5] Kenneth Langton and M. Kent Jennings, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum in the United States," American Political Science Review 62:3 (September 1968), 852-867. See also M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi, The Political Character of Adolescence: The Influence of Families and Schools (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1974).

[6] See, for example, Roy E. Horton, Jr., "American Freedom and the Values of Youth," in H. H. Remmers, ed., Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools (Evanston, ILL: Northwestern University Press, 1963), 18-60; and H. R. Rodgers, Jr., "The Civics Curriculum and Southern School Children: The Impact of Segregated and Integrated School Environments," Journal of Politics 35 (1973), 1002-1007.

[7] Ina V. S. Mullis, "Effects of Home and School on Learning Mathematics, Political Knowledge and Political Attitudes," Denver, CO: National Assessment of Educational Progress, April, 1979.

[8] John J. Patrick, "The Impact of an Experimental Course, 'American Political Behavior,' on the Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes of Secondary School Students," Social Education 36 (1972), 168-179.

[9] See, for example, Walter R. Borg, "Student Government and Citizenship Education," Elementary School Journal 67:3 (December 1966), 154-160; Walter R. Borg, Harry Bluhn, and Norman C. Gibbons, Student Government as a Vehicle for Citizenship Education (Logan, UT: Bureau of Educational Research, Utah State University, 1966); Jack Dennis, et al., A Pilot Experiment in Early Childhood Political Learning. Report from the Project on Concepts in Political Science (Madison, WI: R&D Center for Cognitive Learning, September 1968), ED 043 368; Francis Thomas Sherry, A Study of the Effect of Lessons in Political Science on Fifth Grade Children, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1976.

[10] National Assessment of Educational Progress, Changes in Political Knowledge and Attitudes, 1969-1976 (Denver: National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1978).

[11] Dennis R. Goldenson, "An Alternative View About the Role of the Secondary School in Citizenship Education: A Field Experimental Study of the Development of Civic Liberties Attitudes," Theory and Research in Social Education 6:1 (March, 1978), 44-72.

[12] See Robert John Ellison, *A Study of the Effects of Value Clarification on Political Attitudes*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 1974; George Levenson, "The School's Contribution to the Learning of Participatory Responsibility," in Byron C. Massialas, ed., *Political Youth, Traditional Schools* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), 123-135; David D. Marsh, *Education for Political Involvement: A Pilot Study of Twelfth Graders*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1973; Michael Jerome Rockler, *The Effects of a Junior High School Course in Political Behavior on Political Socialization*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1969.

[13] For a more complete discussion of this conclusion, see Ehman, op. cit.

[14] Judith V. Torney, A. N. Oppenheim and Russell F. Farnen, *Civic Education in Ten Countries* (New York: John Wiley, 1975).

[15] Again, see my more extensive review on this generalization (Ehman, op. cit.)

[16] The literature on this is reviewed in Ehman, op. cit. Here are a few pertinent references: Simon Wittes, "School Organization and Political Socialization," in Byron C. Massialas, ed., *Political Youth, Traditional Schools* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972), 103-117; Michael Eric Siegel, "Citizenship Education in Five Massachusetts High Schools," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 5:2 (August, 1977), 52-76; Madeline Rafaledes and Wayne K. Hoy, "Student Sense of Alienation and Pupil Control Orientations of High Schools," *High School Journal* 55 (December, 1971), 101-111; Wayne Hoy, "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Characteristics of Secondary Schools and Student Alienation." Final report on project number 9 B160 to U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, January, 1971, ED 046 060; Lee H. Ehman and Judith A. Gillespie, "The School as a Political System." Final report, N.I.E. Grant NE-G00-3-0163, September, 1975; Devon J. Metzger and Robert D. Barr, "The Impact of School Political Systems on Student Political Attitudes," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 6:2 (June, 1978), 48-79.

[17] See my review on this point (Ehman, op. cit.). Some references which support the generalization are: Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen, op. cit.; Levenson, op. cit.; Alicia Allman-Snyder, et. al., "Classroom Structure and Children's Perceptions of Authority: An Open and Closed Case," *Urban Education* 10:2 (July, 1975), 131-149; Lee H. Ehman, "Social Studies Instructional Factors Causing Change in High School Students' Socio-Political Attitudes Over a Two Year Period," unpublished paper presented at the AERA meeting, New York, April, 1977; Lee H. Ehman, "An Analysis of the

Relationships of Selected Educational Variables with the Political Socialization of High School Students," *American Educational Research Journal* 6 (November, 1969), 559-580; Lee H. Ehman, "Political Efficacy and the High School Social Studies Curriculum," in Byron G. Massialas, ed., *Political Youth, Traditional Schools: National and International Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 90-102; Allen D. Glenn, "Elementary School Children's Attitudes Toward Politics," in Byron G. Massialas, ed., *Political Youth, Traditional Schools: National and International Perspectives* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972), 51-63; David L. Grossman, "Educational Climates and Attitudes Toward Dissent: A Study of Political Socialization of Conflict Norms in Adolescents," unpublished paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974, ED 090 127; Willis D. Hawley, "The Implicit Civics Curriculum: Teacher Behavior and Political Learning," (Durham, N. C.: Center for Policy Analysis, Duke University, 1976); Willis D. Hawley and William G. Cunningham, Working Paper: "The Implicit Civics Curriculum: Teacher Behavior and Political Learning," (Durham, N. C.: Center for Policy Analysis, Duke University, 1975).

INTRODUCTION TO COMMENTARIES ON HUMAN GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Nicholas M. Sanders, Research Coordinator
Citizen Education, Research for Better Schools, Inc.

In the two commentaries which follow, there is basic support of David Elkind's focus on the psychological rights of the child as a citizen. In fact, one commentator congratulates Elkind for providing practitioners with such a "driving idea," in pleasant contrast to the "bloodless theorists" usually presenting papers at this type of colloquia.

Both commentators, George French and Jeanette Gallagher, agree with and elaborate on one of Elkind's specific areas of concern, the child's right to grow as a totality. French points out that as a curriculum developer he is concerned with the extent to which most curricula are so fragmented as to violate essentially this right of the child. As one illustration, he focuses attention on the current popularity of a return to "basics," which means to most people stripping the curriculum, especially in the early grades, of everything but reading and arithmetic.

Jeanette Gallagher elaborates on the ways in which labeling the child violates the child's right to grow as a totality. She refers to recent writing by Bronfenbrenner, who characterizes most human development research and application as being based on a "deficit model." The deficit model results in children being labeled relative to particular disturbances in their development. Once identified, the particular deficiency is the focus of treatment, while other aspects of the child's life are ignored. Gallagher notes that those applying Piagetian conceptions of development to education are often among those who engage in the deficit model labeling, even though there is nothing in these concepts that imply use of that model. A "growth model" alternative which encourages the child's growth as a totality is then described by Gallagher.

The commentators raise some issues with specific aspects of Elkind's presentation. French cautions that Elkind's concern regarding the acceptance of differences in the limits of various children may easily be turned into a justification of limits imposed on children of certain backgrounds because of preconceived notions about their natural limits -- an interpretation basically inconsistent with citizen education in a democracy.

Another issue focuses on Elkind's warnings not to base curriculum development on the fleeting affective interests of children. French suggests that the variety of advice offered by learning theorists concerning the relation of the cognitive and affective domains in the learning process has served only to confuse curriculum people in their attempts to understand the learning process.

There is a positive reaction to the implications of Elkind's position that citizen education is more than a set of courses. French finds it gratifying that a connection was made between the developmental needs of children and the classroom climate, which he sees as conditioning citizen behavior and not merely providing instructional context.

RESPONSE TO

THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN: CHALLENGES IN TODAY'S WORLD

George W. French

The School District of Philadelphia

My reaction to Dr. Elkind's paper will be governed, of course, by my position as a curriculum director in a large urban center. This involves the responsibility for the preparation of curriculum for 13,000 teachers at every grade level to use with all the people's children. This responsibility doesn't bear on the accuracy of Dr. Elkind's observations so much as it influences the manner in which I shall respond. Specifically, I shall look first at the curriculum implications for citizen education of Dr. Elkind's developmental concerns and second, I shall ask Dr. Elkind to clarify some areas of confusion generated for me by his paper.

First, it is gratifying to see the connection made between classroom climate and the developmental needs of children and citizen education. So often, citizen education is relegated to the social studies where experiences in American government, American heritage and related subjects constitute young people's preparation for citizenship. Aside from the fact that it is a very restricted view of citizen education, this approach overlooks the significant processes in the classroom that condition behavior much more so than the content of the instruction. Dr. Elkind is correct, in my view, when he asserts that young people have psychological rights that should not be violated. The violation of these psychological rights undermines the two basic principles of any citizen education, the concern for the rights of the individual and human dignity. You cannot superimpose content on a foundation where such rights have been violated and expect to attain the desired behavioral outcomes.

Second, there is the right to grow as a totality. Speaking as a curriculum developer rather than a developmental psychologist, I would reaffirm that right. In our zeal to return to the "basics" we have too often stripped the curriculum, especially the primary unit of the elementary school, of everything but the so-called essentials: reading, writing and arithmetic—and often there is very little writing. Children are reduced to pawns in a political and bureaucratic game where standardized tests measure skills developed without references to any context based either on the interests of children or on professionally developed curriculum. There seems to be a feeling abroad that experiences in science and human behavior must await the acquisition of proficient skills in reading and computing. The argument advanced is that the good citizen is the literate citizen. But the overemphasis on development of the basic skills to the exclusion or neglect of other areas denies the child at the most crucial point in his education the right to grow and learn as a totality.

Beyond this violation of the child's right to grow as a totality, we must inspect existing curricula and their purposes in most schools today. The curriculum of too many school systems reflects two processes that educators have not yet arrested or corrected. The two processes involve the fragmentation of and additions to the curriculum. The elementary school curriculum, where the idea of growth as a totality is crucial, is perhaps the most fragmented in spite of the self-contained nature of most elementary school classrooms. This fragmentation is reflected in an overemphasis at the very early stages on skill development without an accompanying conscious effort to build a foundation for development in cognitive areas other than the basic skills and in affective areas that have been continuously identified by developmental psychologists as important for the healthy growth of young people. The school gives an occasional glimpse of surrounding reality but without any unifying theme or purpose. A little of this and a little of that when time can be stolen from the development of basic skills is the school's response to the explosion and implosion of information with which the modern child must contend. The world has moved into a modern neolithic stage while the schools remain at a modern paleolithic stage.

Occasionally, when this disjointed state of affairs is recognized, action is taken in the form of adding to the curriculum. The addition is often a response to a situation that has grown sharply and critically problematical. The process for such addition is usually simply to add the missing ingredient to the existing themeless stew and expect it to be taught or, more probably, ignored. The picture presented to the informed observer is a fuzzy one of uncoordinated purpose sharpened only by a dedication to the development of skills and processes the value of which changes with every technological advance.

The right to grow and learn as a totality in an increasingly complex, interdependent world is imperative, and citizen education must take new shapes and an expanded definition to meet the demands of this imperative. Today's world demands a modern redefining of the Greek notion of paideia. Citizen education cannot assume that the learner can step out of himself/herself to enter some fragmented school process which produces a citizen. The learner is always, as Elkind states, a growing, knowing and showing individual. He/she communicates in a world enormously sophisticated in its means of communication. He/she learns in a schoolroom setting of discrete experiences that is far different from the real outside world of simultaneous experiences. He/she is involved in a process of accepting tremendous loads of information as he/she seeks to make sense out of a world that often seems irrational to his/her adult stewards. He/she seeks the means to give scope to that fundamental need of human beings to be expressive. It is therefore important to heed Elkind's warning that children have a right to grow and a right to grow as a totality. It is therefore important to underline the understanding that fragmented, unidimensional citizen education presents the danger of producing decision makers without wisdom, technicians without human understanding, and citizens whose psychological rights have been so violated as to render them incapable of the new human shapes necessary to survive and find fulfillment in a world receding into human indifference.

Third, Elkind maintains, there is the right to grow at one's own rate and pace. Again, I am in fundamental agreement with Dr. Elkind's assertion that the artificial acceleration of intellectual, emotional and social growth is a violation of the child's psychological rights, and generally is a fruitless endeavor. Today's students have greater demands on them than students in any previous generations.

The amount and depth of knowledge necessary to understand the everyday world has tempted parents and educators to accelerate intellectual and social processes. Very often, as parents and educators we transfer our anxieties to our wards and turn them into machines whose only human expression is that of anxiety. One must note, however, that the call for an understanding of limits is a two-edged one. One must question the use of the phrase "misconstrued egalitarianism," especially at a conference on citizen education. And, one must be concerned about the dangers lurking beneath the statements "equal under the law . . . equal access to education."

It is important that we understand that children have limits at given stages of development, but it is equally important to understand the day-by-day process by which limits are imposed on some children because of preconceived notions of these children, their limits, and their right to know, express and expand. The notion of "misconstrued egalitarianism" used as an argument for establishing limits for some children is often an expression of dwindling faith in the democratic creed. It is a departure from that basic notion that education serves to provide each generation with the means to establish the real equality of people and to prevent society from becoming increasingly stratified both intellectually and socially. Such notions, along with the statement "equal access to education," often hide an implicit view that the bell-shaped curve is a reflection of reality. In our concern for the psychological rights of children, we should see the shifting views of reality, which history informs us of, as instructive so that we do not burden children with the conceits of our times.

I must confess perplexity regarding Dr. Elkind's remarks about the affective and cognitive interests of children and these two domains in the learning process. It has been my understanding that the emphasis on the affective domain in recent years has been a reaction to a previous overemphasis on the cognitive domain in years past. The learning psychologists I have encountered in discussions about such matters have assured me that any differentiation between the two domains was purely for practical purposes of investigation and discussion. The cognitive and the affective domains had been described as the gasoline and fire of the learning process. To neglect or to overemphasize one or the other was to rob children of the naturalness and intrinsic joy of learning. I understand and appreciate Dr. Elkind's warning to curriculum people to exercise great care when developing curriculum and to make sure we are aware of the fleeting interests and the status-seeking nature of our learners. But curriculum people need fewer confusing signals from learning theorists about the learning process and about the role of the cognitive and affective domains in that process

Finally, I must offer Dr. Elkind my heartiest congratulations for a message conveyed with a driving idea. It sometimes seems to the practitioners that such conferences as these are too often peopled by bloodless theorists whose presentations reek of manipulative notions or conditioners of behavior which belie the basic message of Dr. Elkind. The idea that children have certain inviolable psychological rights including the right to grow as a totality, the right to grow at one's own rate, the right to know and to show, is an idea equal in importance to its political counterpart and the political rights that thus ensue. This idea provides a foundation for good citizen education. It can help lift the teaching profession beyond a whimpering dismay about the inadequacies of its wards, beyond a search for tools of manipulation to bring about preconceived notions of desired behavior, to an understanding of the power of education to free and expand teacher and learner to create a community of learning that enhances real citizen education. The history of American education informs us as to the consequences when we neglect the totality of human growth.

The mixture of religion, romanticism and rationalism, along with nationalism and utilitarianism, that has characterized citizen education in American history, has been punctuated by sharp and often opposite reactions when one of these forces is overemphasized. This is the historical correction for ignoring the total growth of the individual, but the price for such lessons is too high for educators to continue to accept with good conscience. Dr. Elkind's driving idea reminds us once more of our task and mission as educators.

PIAGET'S GROWTH MODEL VERSUS A DEFICIT MODEL: EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PREADOLESCENT

Jeanette McCarthy Gallagher

Temple University

In Bronfenbrenner's (1979) The Ecology of Human Development we are presented with a challenge to study children according to a new blueprint: the analysis of the layers of the environment that have great influence on the child. This is precisely Elkind's point in the previous paper: the child's right to be treated as a total person. Bronfenbrenner complements Elkind's thesis by pointing out the problems of a "deficit model" that pervades both research and practical application in the discipline of human development.

Consider the meaning and pervasiveness of a deficit model. Such a model is based on the assumption that when an inadequacy or a disturbance is found in human development (that is not obviously organic), then there certainly must be some deficiency within the child or within the child's immediate environment. First one looks for apathy, hyperactivity, learning disabilities, defense mechanisms and so forth. If such probing fails, then one looks to the parents--surely there must be a lack of cognitive stimulation, an ill-balanced marital relationship, or personalities fixated at the preoedipal level! Suppose one fails again. Then one may turn to the ethnic group or social group. So we have millions of professionals who are at this moment looking for deficiency and hoping to correct it. But how strong is this hope? At the level of the social group, we ask do these people really want to change?

We are so surrounded by the mentality of a deficit model that at times it may seem difficult even to consider alternatives. In simplest terms, our thinking proceeds as follows: a child has a problem; therefore, there is something missing within the child, or within the child's neighborhood. One is especially struck by the pervasiveness of the deficit model when listening to teachers and administrators in our schools. Problems seem almost insurmountable because they are said to be rooted in deficits created by drugs, parental apathy, excessive television, and lack of discipline. Little attention is focused upon a "change model," that is, one of growth and creativity. Much psychic energy may be wasted, for example, in focusing upon lack of parental involvement in the school. The roots of this noninvolvement may be so complex that no one teacher or administrator may effect a change.

A teacher who is motivated by a change model, however, will constantly evaluate teaching methods and interactions with students to determine if he or she sparks interest in the subject matter. This is the teacher's area to effect change. A highly motivated teacher will focus on the positive characteristics of students and not on their deficits.

Let us consider in some detail a trend in the application of Piagetian theory which is linked to a deficit model. There is a movement to label junior and senior high school students (and, in some cases, college students) as either concrete or formal operational thinkers. According to Piagetian theory, a child (roughly ages 6 to 12) thinks about reality and solves problems from the perspective of the concrete, the here and now. At around age 12, the preadolescent begins to solve problems from the perspective of the possible or even the impossible as in Piaget's latest emphasis (Piaget, 1976).

Unfortunately, the original work by Inhelder and Piaget (1958) on the development of thinking in adolescents was almost entirely centered upon science experiments, especially physics. Now it is known that whether or not an adolescent fails to solve a research task designed to investigate thinking at the formal thought level may depend upon many factors: knowledge of science, the scoring system used, cognitive style, or the individual's unique approach to the problem (Gallagher & Noppe, 1976; Gallagher & Mansfield, in press).

Researchers who checked the original protocols at the Archives de Jean Piaget found that there were unique solutions to the problems first given by Inhelder. But because only a few representative protocols were selected for publication, these unique solutions or strategies, even though advanced and certainly at the formal level, were filed in the archives.

However, if a student is given a "formal thought test" today and does not "pass" items according to the test constructor's standards, he or she could be labeled "concrete operational." To label an adolescent as concrete operational and provide curriculum materials to match is another example of operating from a deficit model. What is implied by the "concrete operational" label? First, such adolescents certainly are not able to handle abstract concepts such as the setting up of possibilities or the separation of variables. Secondly, such adolescents are to be taught new concepts by starting always in the concrete, that is, hands-on manipulations and diagrams. Carrying this labeling to its extreme, it might be assumed that these adolescents could not handle the abstract concepts of justice and democracy which are basic to any citizen education effort.

Why is this labeling a corruption of Piagetian theory? We all need hands-on, concrete examples of difficult concepts. In such complex areas as the study of electricity or the structural analysis of literature, we are aided by diagrams, models, analogies, and "here and now" examples. Without such aids we may not be able to grasp basic fundamentals. To need such aids for understanding, however, does not make a person "fixated" at some lower level of cognitive development.

We should be deeply concerned about this false division between concrete and operational students. Our concern should echo Elkind's stress upon children's right to be treated as whole persons. The fallacy in the division is that the criterion is based upon solution of problems drawn from science. But Piaget never meant that formal thought was to be bound up exclusively with science (Gallagher, 1978). Such a concentration would be a fragmenting of children's wide range of interests.

A related concern is that we will ignore the transitional period to formal thought, approximately between the ages of 10 to 12. There is growing evidence that this transition period is one of rapid and important change. Let us briefly consider two research areas to highlight the dramatic shift in thinking in this transitional period.

The first research area is that of self-description (Montemayor & Eisen, 1975). Suppose we ask children between the ages of 9 through 19 to give 20 answers to the question: "Who am I?" A surprising finding is that an 11-year-old is more likely to give answers that sound more like a 17-year-old than a 9-year-old. Younger children list a set of elements such as "I like to play baseball" or "I like to play tennis." Starting at preadolescence, the children are more likely to start listing superordinate categories such as "I like sports" or "I like athletics." In addition, the younger children in the sample gave many descriptions of discrete elements such as brown eyes or hair. In the transition period, however, a shift could be found to interpersonal and personality traits which are more significant in self-description as compared to discrete elements.

A second research area that clearly points out the significant shift in thinking at the preadolescent period is that of the solution of analogies. For the past two years, I have been involved in the analysis of written reasons for why children select a certain answer to complete a verbal analogy (Gallagher, 1978a,b; Gallagher & Wright, 1979). Around the age of 11 or 12 may be noted a flexibility of structure almost totally missing at earlier ages. For example, consider the analogy: Motor is to a car as man is to bicycle which is of the form A is to B as C is to D. Younger children have to spell out the reason in their written statement: "Motor helps drive the car and the man pumps the bicycle." At the transitional period of preadolescence may first be noted examples of the statement of a rule and true inversion of terms. The rule may be: "They are the energy receivers" or "This is where the power comes from." An example of a true inversion would be "Motor and man provide the power for car and bicycle" which takes the form: A is to C as B is to D. Note that such answers relate to the superordinate categories of the self-perception research.

What is evident from these research areas is the significant shift in the quality of thinking at the time of preadolescence. Therefore, instead of emphasizing what preadolescents cannot do or placing them in categories, the more productive position is to capitalize upon the new foundations of thinking that appear at this age level. Again, instead of a deficit model, we need to opt for a change or growth model.

During a recent interview with a junior high school counselor, I asked what was the most frequent frustration named by the students who came to his office. The counselor replied that teachers are too prone to present topics in the same way as in grade school. Even though the content may be more complex, when a topic such as the Bill of Rights is presented, the students feel it is more of the "same old stuff." These teachers, then, may not be tapping into the new abilities and interests of this level. Junior high students need opportunities for such learning activities as lively debates, dramatizations (an "imaginary country" with no Bill or Rights), mock television news programs, and interviews with citizens who have lived under restricted freedom.

Piaget's theory is basically one of growth according to a spiral model (Gallagher, 1978b; Gallagher & Reid, in press). Each stage opens up new possibilities. For the preadolescent, we may add an additional need to Elkind's list: the need to challenge thinking!

References

Bronfenbrenner, U. The ecology of human development. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Gallagher, J. M. The future of formal thought research: The study of analogy and metaphor. In B. Presseisen, D. Goldstein, & M. Appel (Eds.), Topics in cognitive development: Studies in language and operational thought (Vol. 2). New York: Plenum, 1978. (a)

Gallagher, J. M. Reflexive abstraction and education: The meaning of activity in Piaget's theory. In J. M. Gallagher & J. A. Easley (Eds.), Knowledge and development. Vol. 2: Piaget and education. New York: Plenum, 1978. (b)

Gallagher, J. M. & Noppe, I. Cognitive development and learning in the adolescent. In J. Adams (Ed.), Understanding adolescence (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Gallagher, J. M. & Mansfield, R. J. Cognitive development and learning in the adolescent. In J. Adams (Ed.), Understanding adolescence (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, in press.

Gallagher, J. M. & Wright, R. J. Structure of analogy items: A Piagetian interpretation. In J. Magary (Ed.), Piaget and the helping professions (Vol. 8). Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1979.

Gallagher, J. M. & Reid, D. K. The learning theory of Piaget and Inhelder. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, in press.

Inhelder, B. & Piaget, J. The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Montemayor, R. & Eisen, M. The development of self-perceptions in children and adolescents. In M. S. Smart & R. C. Smart (Eds.), Adolescents; development and relationships (2nd ed). New York: Macmillan, 1978.

Piaget, J. The possible, the impossible, and the necessary. The genetic epistemologist: Quarterly newsletter of the Jean Piaget society, 1976, 6, 1-6.

INTRODUCTION TO COMMENTARIES ON INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Barbara Z. Presseisen, Director
Citizen Education, Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Joyce Epstein considers Paul Gump's paper on ecological psychology significant to the study of children and to the planning of schooling for citizen education. She indicates that his views show the various perspectives brought to education from several social sciences: psychology, sociology, and anthropology. To some extent, Epstein underlines Lee Ehman's thesis that the environment is concerned with the way tasks are organized for instruction and need not be related to the curriculum itself. These various organizations are the structures of the school environment.

Epstein maintains that research at the Center for Social Organization of Schools at the Johns Hopkins University can be related to Gump's work. She compares studies of various reward structures in schools to his cooperative learning synomorphs and provides answers based on empirical studies to Gump's questions concerning the relation between climate and student achievement. Authority structures, the central concerns of school governance patterns, are discussed by Epstein and related to changes in both teacher and student behavior. Student decision-making roles, which are related to pedagogical style or milieu, influence attitude formation among students, says Epstein. She advocates "varied structural designs" in schools seeking effective citizen education.

Finally, Epstein calls for a better, clearer definition of citizen education. She suggests some synomorphs which can create environments capable of facilitating such education. She calls on researchers and practitioners to assist in the definitional endeavor.

Jean Dresden Grambs finds that many questions are being raised about citizen education but few answers given. She comments on how significant institutional environment research is for educational practice and policy, but how little information about such research is communicated to practitioners. Grambs raises questions about the quality of learning when students attend small schools with high involvement patterns. She also considers the cultural indoctrination role of every school, regardless of the specific institution's environment.

Grambs raises the important question of the role of the school system in Gump's ecological approach. Included in her definition of a school system are the perspectives of the administrators and the teachers who make the schools work. She alludes to the influence of unions and the absence of females in leadership positions, and touches upon these concerns as part of understanding the real power structure of today's educational establishment. Included in her discussion are topics such as the grading system, student selection and reward, and motivation for teaching in what she considers essentially a nondemocratic system. Grambs resists the bell-shaped curve and suggests, in agreement with George French, that neither citizen education nor schooling-at-large can afford to be enterprises with built-in failure.

John DeCecco and Petra Liljestrand present a pragmatic model for resolving school conflicts on the basis of negotiation in the school environment. Conflict in their model is seen as the dynamic force that both threatens to destroy the learning environment and offers the drive that can transform the environment's dysfunctional tensions. As Elkind maintains, the student is seldom treated as a total being. DeCecco and Liljestrand similarly suggest the school is an institution often approached in fragmented, non-integrated ways. Negative conflict contributes to this fractionalization. Violence and vandalism, rising incidents of crime, and generally disruptive student behavior are specific school concerns prevalent in today's educational institutions about which conflict negotiation can be organized.

DeCecco and Liljestrand present alternate modes to resolving school conflict and compare the benefits and deficits of each for influencing positive citizen education. They point out that negotiation as a mode of resolution has been relatively neglected in the school. They suggest it is the most productive tactic for building the positive, creative forces of education called for by Jean Grambs and stressed by Jeanette Gallagher's "growth model" alternative. A six-step model of negotiation is outlined and extensively discussed. The steps of the model are examined within the context of desirable rights in a civic or citizen education program. The model suggests a living lesson in citizen education to be carried out within an institution that seeks to be democratic, as well as educational.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SYNOMORPHS AND SOCIOLOGICAL STRUCTURES

Joyce L. Epstein

The Johns Hopkins University

In the past, sociologists and psychologists have enjoyed a cold war, taunting and harassing each other about whose research is more basic, whose terminology more accurate, whose implications more generalizable or more applicable for solving human problems. Paul Gump, a psychologist with new terminology for school activities, could be the target of sociological sallies. However, Gump's paper is too important for its similarity to current emphases of sociology of education research to play games of academic altercations. Indeed, it is the isomorphy--the similarity of forms of different ancestry--of ecological psychology and sociology of education on the topic Gump addresses that deserves attention.

The similar emphases will be apparent if I describe a research program at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools. In this program, we examine the effects on students of contrasting structures in educational environments. We have selected for research structures that are manipulable by the classroom teacher and that are likely to improve student achievement, attitudes or behavior. We have defined the task, reward and authority structures as the manipulable building blocks of classroom environments that are under the teacher's control. In other words, teachers can change the way tasks, rewards and authority (decision making) experiences are designed and dispensed, without necessarily changing the required curricula for students. In this approach we, like Gump, are placing emphasis on the identification of positive aspects of the classroom environment that may create positive student attitudes and behaviors.

For example, research conducted at the Center on new reward structures is similar to Gump's descriptions of cooperative learning synomorphs. About 14 studies have been completed over the past eight years on student-team learning and rewards for team performance. Teams-Games-Tournament (or TGT) classrooms have been compared with regular classrooms and have been shown to raise student achievement and improve race relations in desegregated settings (DeVries and Slavin, in press; Slavin and DeVries, 1979). This basic research led to a useful product, Student Team Learning, now available to teachers. TGT provides curricula in several subjects across the elementary and junior high grades and also provides a process for restructuring the way rewards are dispensed. The classroom is reorganized to encourage cooperative learning as team members of all abilities study together, learn basic skills, and have equal opportunities to earn points (or rewards) for their teams.

A second example involves research on new authority structures that is similar to Gump's observations in the open environment school in Denver. Longitudinal research conducted at the Center shows that student self-reliance and satisfaction with school life is increased if teachers share classroom decisions with their students. Interestingly, student academic achievement is not significantly changed--positively or negatively--by the revised authority structures. Structures that encourage more student participation in classroom decision making also alter teaching styles and peer processes in ways that improve students' attitudes and behaviors. In classrooms with more teacher-student shared decision making, teachers were perceived by students as more trusting, less defensive, and more encouraging than teachers in regular classrooms. Teachers placed more importance on and rewarded students for original ideas and self-expression (Epstein and McPartland, 1979; McPartland and Epstein, 1977). In these classrooms, there were fewer students left out of friendship groups. More students could find and make some friends in classes where they could choose to work together at Learning Centers or on projects, or where the physical, instructional and psychological conditions encouraged contact among greater numbers of students (Epstein, 1978). It appears that when the power to make academic decisions is shared, the ideas of all participants--teachers and students--are more widely appreciated. In our research, many of the student outcomes that Gump cites as important for effective citizenship were influenced by increased student participation in academic decisions.

A recent field search shows that teachers in all types of school buildings (open and traditional architecture) offer students opportunities to practice decision making from first grade through high school and expect a variety of positive behaviors and attitudes to result. Shared teacher-student authority structures are selected by teachers especially under two conditions. First, when there is great scope and variation in the subject matter, shared authority structures enable the teacher to permit the students to sample and share a range of topics that otherwise would not be covered in one term or one year. Second, when there is great variation in student abilities and/or interests, these structures enable teachers to deal with individual learning schedules and problems (Epstein, 1979). This field search and other research on the relationship between open space architecture and open educational programs (Epstein and McPartland, 1975) suggest that Gump's definition of synomorph may be extended to include not only a fit between a physical milieu and patterns of action, but also a fit between a pedagogical milieu (e.g., curricular scope or demographics of the student population) and patterns of action.

Cooperative learning and shared teacher-student decision making are based on revisions in the reward and authority structures in classrooms, respectively. These two structural reorganizations may emphasize the development of different student outcomes, and each may be more appropriate for different age levels, or for different academic subjects or units within subjects. There may be an optimal mix of alternative structures or synomorphs for the development in students of particular achievements, attitudes and behaviors.

The research Gump reports and the research we have completed suggest strongly the importance of a mixture of structures or synomorphs in schools and classrooms. Some structures selected for the classroom may emphasize cooperation, group goals, and the equal contribution to common goals made by students with greater and lesser talents. Other structures may emphasize leadership, creative and critical thinking, and the importance of decision making by individuals about their own learning activities. Without a purposeful mixture of classroom structures that lead to leadership _and_ cooperation, and that reward individual initiative or special talents _and_ group concern and common goals, the potential of school environments to positively influence student development will not be met.

Research on reward and authority structures suggests that teachers should not be lured into adopting single structural designs for every subject, at every grade level, every day. Neither cooperative learning alone, individualized instruction alone, shared decision making alone, teacher-directed lessons alone, programmed learning alone, mastery learning alone or any other single classroom structural design can produce the necessary mixture of abilities and talents needed for effective citizenship by students or adults. "Good citizens" are those who can advance new ideas and solve problems because of decisions they are able to make, and who can cooperate with others to reach common goals. Both skills are necessary and neither is sufficient for education.

The aim of the research program at Johns Hopkins and the implications of the work described by Gump is to make many alternative structures available to teachers along with well-researched information on their likely consequences for students. We are reaching for that time when the mixing of classroom structures that give form to learning environments is as well understood as the mixing of nutrients for effective individual growth and development. With additional research on the effects on students of structures or synomorphs, teachers and administrators will be able to arrange school environments to maximize the effectiveness of education.

In closing, I would like to raise some questions for discussion that are suggested, not by Gump's paper, but by the topic of this colloquium:

1. It is not yet clear how citizen education is different from education, good education, or education of citizens. If the label "citizen education" is just a useful handle to point to something as important as motherhood, apple pie and basic skills, then we should say so. If someone asked for a definition of "citizen education" would it include everything?

2. Are we talking too much about cooperation and not enough about leadership and excellence because schools are afraid of diversity in students? Are we as guilty of keeping advantaged students from progressing beyond the basics as we have been of keeping disadvantaged students from gaining basic skills? What is the effect on citizen education when schools "let the children learn only a certain amount," or when they "let the children learn as much as they are able"?

3. It is not clear that enough emphasis is being placed on systematic research of effects on students of contrasting school environments. Is it sufficient to implement new forms of classroom environments or school governance, or do we need to pay attention to their effects on learning, motivation, and the development of diverse talents and competencies?

If by "citizen education " we mean cooperation, schools can create structures or synomorphs that encourage togetherness and interdependence. We can measure how well alternative structures do that job for students, and whether the cooperation is long-lasting and/or generalized to other activities and settings. If by "citizen education" we mean critical thinking, careful choice, creativity and leadership, schools can create learning environments that encourage these behaviors. We can measure how well different structures or synomorphs do this job for students, and whether such behaviors are rewarded and lasting. Of course, schools can also create environments that discourage leadership, creativity or cooperation. But it seems necessary to measure the effects on students of the alternatives that are created if schools are ever to maximize the complementary contributions of multiple structures or synomorphs.

The challenge for research is to define the terms better, and create the necessary measures of environments and outcomes to test contrasting theories and models. This requires both cooperation and leadership by researchers and practitioners. It is interesting that these are the very skills we say we want to develop in our student citizens.

REFERENCES

DeVries, D. L. & Slavin, R. E. Teams-Games-Tournament: Review of ten classroom experiments. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, in press. (Also CSOS Reports 217 and 230).

Epstein, J. L. *Friends in school: Patterns of selection and influence in secondary schools* (Report 266). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1978.

Epstein, J. L. *Field search: Practitioners inform research on authority structures* (Report 277). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1979.

Epstein, J. L. & McPartland, J. M. Authority structures. In H. Walberg (Ed.), *Educational environments and effects*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979.

Epstein, J. L. & McPartland, J. M. *The effects of open school organization on student outcomes* (Report 194). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1975.

McPartland, J. M. & Epstein, J. L. Open schools and achievement: Extended tests of a hypothesis of no relationship. *Sociology of Education*, 1977, *42*, 133-144.

Slavin, R. E. & DeVries, D. L. Learning in teams. In H. Walberg (Ed.), *Educational environments and effects*. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1979

CRITIQUE AND RESPONSE TO THE SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT AND CITIZEN EDUCATION

Jean Dresden Grambs

University of Maryland

As the last speaker for this symposium, I have an opportunity and a challenge; I can comment on all the preceding papers and discussions without fear of contradiction, but I also have to add something new--and after the expansive presentations and critiques that have preceded me I had some worry about whether there was more to add. However, do not fear; I think there are some additional comments which I can make which I hope will move us forward in the area of citizen education.

There is in fact almost too much to be commented on. I am reminded of a story which was going the rounds in Washington the last days of March. Question: "What is the five day forecast for Harrisburg?" Answer: "Three days." For citizen education I would ask: "What is the five year forecast?" and the answer would be "Fifty years." I believe that this colloquium has provided ample evidence that not only is there a great deal of research relevant to citizen education; there is even more that we do not know. I think we will be in business for a very long time indeed.

It has been made very clear that we do not know very much about what goes on in classrooms, and that we do need to learn more in this field if we are to develop successful and effective interventions. Additionally, we do not know much at all about what goes on in the interstices of the school--such as school lavatories, hallways, cafeterias, buses, locker areas, and playgrounds. We can all agree on this.

What is possibly more distressing, however, is that what we do know does not seem to make a difference. For example, in preparation for this colloquium I obtained a newly published book by Rudolf Moos, _The Evaluation of Education Environments_ (1979). I was intrigued by the extensive review of the research literature on the impact that many kinds of classroom environments have on student interaction, student attitudes toward school work, and student relationships with teachers. Most of the research, I realized, I did not know about since it was published in journals that I do not read regularly. I was additionally struck, when I checked the bibliography, by the fact that Moos himself had not published any of his research in any of the "mass" education journals--the ones that go to practitioners. So I wrote him a letter, out of curiosity, to find out if he had tried to publish in such journals and they had not been receptive, or if he had just not done so for other reasons. He replied almost instantly, to my great gratification, and said in response to my inquiry:

> I had considered publishing some of our material in what you call the "mass" educational journals, particularly _Educational Leadership_, but I simply never found the time to do it. Since our funding is primarily from research grants, our first priority necessarily needs to be oriented toward publishing our work in research-type journals. But I do agree that our work has significant implications for practice, and I try to set out some of these implications for practice . . .

> Let me say that I would be delighted if either you or one of your colleagues were interested in writing an article on the practical implications of my own and other investigators' work on classroom learning environments.

Such a response suggest one of the real problems not only in citizen education but in education as a whole: the persons who have done basic research, who have gleaned a few insights into the process of schooling, only speak and write to and for one another.

Practitioners are not consumers of scholarly research. So much of what is known about socialization, for example, that could be applied in classrooms, is never communicated in a meaningful way to those who might profit from it. The dissemination problem has dogged educators in almost every area including research.

There may also be some questions about the research that we do learn about. I was an early reader of the Roger Barker-Paul Gump research on big and small schools. I was particularly fascinated, since my teaching experience was first in a very large junior-senior high school in a big city and then in a four-year high school in the foothills of the Sierras with a total school population of 150 students. I certainly acknowledge that the small school provides substantially more teacher-student contact than the big school, and the small school "needs" all of its students to undertake any of the usual school activities. Every boy in my small high school, for example, was on some varsity team, because there were so few boys! But because students get more opportunities to participate in non-academic activities does that mean they are different? Better? Did the size of the school make a difference in the students' eventual behavior as citizens? My hunch is that they all end up as Americans--whatever that means. In my class in the small school I had the son of the county sheriff, who told us with pride that when the evacuation of the Japanese from the West Coast was announced in the early days of World War II, his father had stationed men at the county line so that "none of those Japs could get into our territory!"

I have not seen evidence in the research that products of big or small schools are identifiable in adulthood for greater increments of "better" citizen involvement. I would suspect, too, that the individual visibility which is an asset in one sense, in the small school could also be a hazard. Such visibility--the Main Street syndrome, if you will--inhibits the student who would be different. Interestingly, the riots and disorders of the late 60s and early 70s appeared to occur with far greater frequency in large than in small schools. Also, many of these school disorders were prompted by highly idealistic expectations. In my small high school the students threatened to strike because intercollegiate sports were suspended for the duration of the war. I cannot imagine their calling for a strike for peace, or for civil rights for anyone.

It is important to remember that schools produce the kind of citizen consistent with that culture: Japanese schools produce Japanese citizens; German schools produce German citizens; French schools do likewise. The series edited by George Spindler, Case Studies in Education and Culture (1968-1973) provides vivid documentation of the variety of schooling which disparate cultures support. Thus far we have not clearly isolated and identified that which is peculiarly "American" about American schools--that which does, in fact, produce the American citizen who is recognizable at 20 yards in any foreign country.

Another significant factor in the development of citizen education is referred to in Paul Gump's paper. He notes in his opening section that "staff also live in this sociopolitical organization" and that "we plan" what happens within the school. If I were drawing a diagram, I would enclose all the elements that he had noted--school, student and teacher--in a large all-encompassing box labeled "the system." Paul refers, at the end of his paper, to the problems of reforming "dysfunctional settings." A major omission in this colloquium is any discussion of or attention to the school "system" and who runs it, or to the teachers who process the system's many messages regarding citizen behavior and education.

An immediate question arises: why don't teachers do all the good things that we know about? The Teams-Games-Tournaments (TGT) procedures developed by Johns Hopkins are exciting and proven effective in both the achievement dimension and in the reduction of interracial conflict dimensions. Yet few schools have even heard about them.

Twenty-seven years ago, when I was a young and hungry assistant professor at Stanford, a colleague and I wrote a textbook, Modern Methods in Secondary Education. The fourth edition was published this spring (Grambs & Carr, 1979). It has had a good enough record of student acceptance (and sales) that the publishers agreed to a fourth edition despite dropping enrollments in teacher education. So you can see it is a good book! What was most depressing about the new revision, however, was that several key chapters--notably the one on the democratic classroom and the one on small group processes--have remained substantially the same since the 1952 edition. What we said back then is just as valid today; the only problem is that the education profession still needs to be told these things. Students coming to us today are as unaware of democratic school practices (because they have never experienced them in their pre-college or college environments) as were their counterparts in 1952. And they are equally innocent of experience with small group work. What we proposed then, and what I also incorporated in a monograph for the National Conference of Christians and Jews in 1955, bears a family resemblance to the TGT procedures of Johns Hopkins. We too claimed that such processes would reduce intergroup tension. I can't say that Johns Hopkins is reinventing a wheel we discovered a quarter of a century ago, but I can say that their procedures are not all that new, either. Why have these insights into schooling been so marginally accepted? Why are "scholars" discovering what practitioners recommended years back?

The complex problems of dissemination and diffusion of educational innovation cannot be addressed here. I might suggest, however, that insufficient attention has been given to the social system of the school: the question of who has the power in the classroom and the perceptions of how that power is utilized (Grambs, 1978). Teachers, I believe, are socialized by the system into a state of "learned powerlessness" by the hierarchical structure of the system. It is in the interest of administrators for them to induce these feelings in teachers. Despite the teachers' union activity, powerlessness over their in-school academic and instructional decisions appears to be an enduring attribute of the teacher role. Maybe the people who become teachers are ones who want and like the paternalistic (most of the administrators are men) dictatorship entrenched in the system (Grambs, 1950). In most cases, teachers enjoy great power over students, and in turn transmit to the students a sense of powerlessness over their in-school fate. Is this part of the reason why teachers consistently resist sharing decision making with students and resist efforts to enlarge the areas of responsibility that youth need to develop mature citizen behavior?

Teachers perceive, too, that the psychic reward system of the school militates against the kinds of practices research has shown to be effective in developing citizen behavior. Administrators appear not to reward teachers who promote cooperative behavior. In part, of course, this is a reflection of the inability of admistrators themselves to share decision making and develop cooperative problem solving among faculty. I will believe that students can learn democratic citizen behavior when I find a school which can work out a procedure to keep lavatories open, functional, and clean without the use of uniformed security guards. That administrators do not appreciate teachers above the primary grades who promote cooperative behavior should not be surprising. Teachers who follow such deviant classroom practices do so because they know the practices work and believe in them. These teachers are sufficiently autonomous not to need administrator approval or support.

We need to return to the problem of the dysfunctional system and its survival through thick and thin. Who gets the payoff from the system? If we can answer that question, we might have a clue to our dilemma.

The school is supposed to work as an essential sorting system on the basis of earned merit. There is no true inherited social class status. Therefore there is no assurance that those who ought to benefit (the doctor's son) will benefit more than those who ought not to benefit (the welfare mother's daughter). As a result, the system must be manipulated so that meritocracy in fact will not function. A careful study by James Rosenbaum (1978) on the sorting procedures of a relatively typical high school showed how those who "ought" to go to college were effectively tracked in that direction, and those who "ought not" to go to college were effectively (and covertly) deflected from that goal.

There is an "X" factor in our educational system that underlies and subverts every effort to achieve genuine democratic classroom practices. This "X" factor is the failure-base grading system. It is accepted by all who organize and participate in the educational enterprise that some students must fail. Problems have arisen with any educational innovation which promises that all students could learn and pass: Bloom's mastery learning and programmed learning are but two examples. I suspect the Johns Hopkins material will meet the same fate if it results in raising the learning level of all students so that failure is eliminated. The system requires failure.

The payoff from this sorting process goes, of course, to those who already have social status or access to social mobility. The system is wholeheartedly supported by parents of children who succeed, who were themselves successful school achievers, even if the sorting process has to be distorted to get the desired results. Some cynics even suggest that our social order requires a subclass which is more or less permanently undereducated (Bowles, 1972). How can we expect appropriate and effective citizen education to occur when the learning environment is so antithetical? The essential egalitarian core of the democratic process is denied within a system which says some are more equal than others; some will have more access to the reward system than others; and some must not be allowed to get through the system successfully.

The dilemma this sorting process poses for teachers must not be underestimated. And the current school climate appears to be making things worse. An article in The Washington Post for May 28, 1979, quotes a report issued by the Fairfax, Virginia, schools regarding the shortages in certain teaching areas, despite the well-publicized oversupply of teachers. The report noted that "teaching is one of the most 'depressing and unpromising' professions." As one official put it, "Teaching is not a fun thing anymore."

As a teacher trainer, I know that most of my students approach their first teaching positions with joy and idealism. Why then do they change in a few years? Why do they not do in the classroom the fine things which, we and they agreed before they went into teaching, make such good sense and make teaching fun? Because the system, they soon learn, does not reward them for such practices. It insists that they become judges, failing those who ought to fail and resisting methods which might be failure-proof.

The sum total of the way the system operates would appear, on the surface, to be counterproductive. How can such a system produce the democratic citizen which we desire? The miraculous thing, the amazing thing, is that in fact our student do enter adulthood as Americans, committed (often passionately and mostly irrationally, but committed nonetheless) to democracy. We fear the commitment is a fragile thing, which may break under the impact of devastating economic crises or the seductions of a charismatic demogogue of the right or left. We must, therefore, continue to expend every effort to ensure that the citizens our schools produce--despite the nondemocratic system which they endure in those schools--will be committed to democracy, behaviorally, rationally, and forever.

REFERENCES

Bowles, Samuel. Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labor. In Martin Carnoy (Ed.), Schooling in a corporate society. New York: David McKay, 1972, pp. 36-64.

Grambs, Jean D. Do teachers really want democratic administrators? Nation's Schools. 1950, 46 (4).

Grambs, Jean D. Group processes and intergroup education. New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1955.

Grambs, Jean Dresden. Schools, scholars, and society (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Grambs, Jean D., & Iverson, William J. Modern methods in secondary education. New York: William Sloan Associates, 1952. 2nd ed. with William J. Iverson and Franklin Patterson. New York: Dryden Press, 1958. 3rd ed. with John C. Carr and Robert Fitch. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1970. 4th ed. with John C. Carr. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1979.

Moos, Rudolf W. The evaluation of educational environments. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1979.

Rosenbaum, James E. The structure of opportunity in school. Social Forces, 1978, 57 (1), pp. 236-281.

Spindler, George (Ed.), Case studies in education and culture. (16 vols.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968-1973.

Note: A new book just reviewed in the New Republic, June 16, 1979, suggests that school climate is a highly significant factor in differential student behavior: Michael Rutter, et al, Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children (Harvard University Press, 1979).

"Teams, Games, Tournaments" information available from: Johns Hopkins Learning Project, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 3505 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218.

CONFLICT NEGOTIATION AND CITIZEN EDUCATION

John P. De Cecco and Petra Liljestrand
Department of Psychology
San Francisco State University

The purpose of this paper is to present a pragmatic model for resolving school conflicts which can be used as part of a citizen education program in the school. The paper explains the theoretical and conceptual bases for conflict and negotiation; offers a rationale for using negotiation to resolve school conflict; and describes a negotiation model and the research on which it is based. It also discusses the relationship of the model to civic education and makes suggestions for training in negotiation in the school.

Conflict is a phenomenon that occurs in all institutions. It may be defined as one or more incidents in which one party was perceived by the other as threatening to take or taking action against the other party. An example of a conflict as described by a high school student follows:

> Student X was selected as a member of the basketball team. The coach made a rule that students attend practice otherwise student would not play in matches. Student X missed a number of practices and explained to the coach that absence was due to fact of mother not allowing her to stay for practices after school. Student X was, in spite of missed practices, still the strongest player to fill a vacant spot on the team. Other students grumbled that coach would be

> breaking her own rule by allowing student X to play in match. Coach sent letter home to student's mother to explain situation and ask if student could remain after school for practices. Coach also talked with other members of the team and explained student X's absences. Coach played student X in match on the understanding that she would be able to attend future practices after school and all practices during the lunch breaks. (De Cecco & Richards, 1974, p. 27)

The example is a conflict in that there was an implied threat by the teacher to take action against the student by not allowing her to play in the matches if she broke the practice rule. The conflict contains several key incidents: the occasions when the student missed practice, the student explaining the reason for missing practice, the other students grumbling over the coach's reluctance to enforce the practice rule, and the coach sending the letter to the student's home.

Conflict is not always negative. Coser (1969, p. 31), for example, points out that "no group can be entirely harmonious, for it would then be devoid of process and structure," and describes a number of positive functions of conflict: (1) it establishes the individual's ego identity and autonomy; (2) it strengthens group consciousness and cohesiveness; (3) it stabilizes functions through the resolution of tension in relationships; (4) it results in creativity and growth by posing new challenges; and (5) it results in the development of new systems by questioning the status quo.

Conflict, then, can be viewed as a "central explanatory category for the analysis of social change and progress" (Coser, 1969, p. 16). It also, however, may be destructive. Deutsch (1973) refers to destructive conflict, which is conflict that is unilaterally resolved through aggression or physical violence.

Both students and the school as an institution may be caught up in destructive conflict. The school may contribute to destructive conflict in several ways. First, it is an environment where students and teachers of different ethnic, social class, religious and political backgrounds may clash. Second, the school does not give students a chance to express anger and disagreement over their treatment by the school authorities. There is little opportunity for students to express their side and hear the other side of conflicts, but such an opportunity is necessary if students are to develop the ability to view conflicts from the point of view of others as well as themselves. Third, by passing out high grades to relatively few students, the school encourages students to compete. Competition may cause some students to cheat, to give up attempts to learn, to develop hostile relations with other students, and to channel energy into destructive behavior. Fourth, teachers may handle problems with students by blaming the students' personalities for their attitudes about school or by resolving conflict through the use of force or avoidance.

The students may also contribute to destructive conflict in a variety of ways: failing to attend school and classes; using prohibited substances, such as alcohol and drugs; disrupting classes and assemblies; sexual acts; stealing and destroying property of the school, school personnel and other students (De Cecco & Roberts, 1978).

The incidence of destructive conflicts in the school has been increasing. A study by the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency reported that vandalism in public schools cost taxpayers $500,000,000 a year (De Cecco & Richards, 1975). In a five-year period (1970 through 1975), there were 70,000 serious assaults on teachers, an increase of 77.4%. Assaults on students increased by 85.3%, robberies by 36.7%, rapes and attempted rapes by 40.1%, homicides by 18%, and weapons confiscated by 54.4%. In a study of Chicago teachers, verbal and physical conflicts with students were ranked among the ten most stressful events (American Educator, 1978, p. 3). In a third study, 1.8% of all large-city high school teachers reported being attacked in one month (Rubel, 1978). The same study suggests that two of the four best ways of reducing violence in schools are (1) to increase efforts in student government and rule enforcement and (2) to treat students fairly and equally.

Rationale for Using Negotiation to Resolve School Conflict

There are several modes of conflict resolution: use of authority, avoidance, force, and negotiation. Conflict is resolved by authority when one party in the conflict imposes a resolution on the other party through the use of power inherent in its institutional role. Traditionally, conflicts in the school have been resolved through the use of authority. The use of authority, however, can have destructive effects on students who are parties to conflicts: it can escalate conflict to crisis, it can result in student violence and vandalism, or it can produce student apathy (De Cecco & Richards, 1974).

When one or both parties make no efforts to deal with the conflict, the conflict may be resolved by avoidance. This mode may take the forms of compliance, denial or removal. Compliance occurs when one party submits to the demands of the other party. Denial occurs when one or both parties ignore or refuse to recognize the existence of the conflict. Removal occurs when the parties have no further contact with each other after the conflict has begun. Avoidance may have negative psychological effects on the individual such as depression, anxiety, guilt, and loss of self-respect. In the long run it may also escalate conflict and result in physical expressions of anger. In schools today, however, avoidance may be the mode of conflict resolution used most often by teachers and students.

Conflict is resolved by force when a party other than an institutional party uses physical or verbal threats or action to impose a resolution on the other party. It is a mode for resolving conflicts used currently by individuals and groups of students to resolve school conflicts. The use of force can have destructive effects on both school personnel and students: it can escalate conflict to crisis, it may result in the spread of violence and vandalism, and those who are victimized may use force in retaliation.

When both parties arrive at and implement their own compromises, conflict is resolved by negotiation. It is a mode of resolution that may be relatively neglected in the school, even though it may have several positive results. First, negotiation can channel anger into energy for creating solutions to problems that neither party alone could have produced. These solutions may result in both individual and institutional changes. Second, negotiation can clarify the roles, relationships, mutual expectations and values of the parties. Third, it may prevent escalating conflict into crisis. Fourth, negotiation might encourage the parties to commit themselves to the resolutions they developed. Finally, using negotiation provides opportunity for students to learn how to resolve conflicts within a framework of protecting the democratic rights of all parties.

Conflict negotiation inevitably has limitations, and is oftentimes not even attempted by the parties because the obstacles seem insurmountable. But if the parties are willing to attempt it, the process of negotiation may channel the creative energy of both parties. Issues that originally appeared nonnegotiable are transformed into potentially negotiable ones.

Description of Model of Negotiation

A six-step model of negotiation for resolving school conflict has been developed (De Cecco & Richards, 1974; De Cecco & Schaeffer, 1978). The six steps are:

Step 1. Stating the issues.

Both parties express their anger, verbally and face-to-face, over specific incidents and issues.

Step 2. Analyzing the issues.

Both parties analyze issues in terms of specific conditions and behavior in the school, and in terms of democratic rights.

Step 3. *Agreeing on what the issues are*.

The parties together prepare statements that include the issues of each party.

Step 4. *Bargaining for an agreement*.

Both parties make proposals for resolving the conflict and reach agreements that balance the gains and losses.

Step 5. *Agreeing on the implementation plan*.

Both parties agree on their respective responsibilities for carrying out the agreement.

Step 6. *Agreeing on the evaluation plan*.

Both parties agree on the persons, methods and time for evaluating if and how well the agreement has been implemented.

The first step of this model is based on the definitions of conflict, incident, issues, and modes of angry expression that are given below.

Conflict. One or more incidents in which one party was perceived by the other as threatening to take or taking action against the other party.

Incident. A single event occurring at a particular time and place and involving particular individuals.

Issues. Specific conditions and behaviors in the school that are challenged. These pertain to the reality of the school's social and physical environment and have been typed by Deutsch (1973) as follows:

(1) Control of resources: the conflict is over control of time, space, money, power or materials. (2) Conflicting values: the conflict involves one party's attempt to impose its values on the other party. (3) Conflicting tastes: the conflict involves one party preferring or doing something that annoys the other party. (4) Conflicting perceptions of facts: the conflict involves the parties' different perceptions of events or motivations. (5) Relationship between parties: the conflict involves parties perceiving their authority or responsibility differently.

Modes of angry expression. Conflicts arouse anger that can be expressed in four general ways: (1) verbally and face-to-face, (2) verbally and not face-to-face, (3) physically and face-to-face, and (4) physically and not face-to-face (De Cecco & Schaeffer, 1978). In the face-to-face verbal expression, parties express anger in words in each other's presence. In the verbal expression that is not face-to-face, the parties express anger in words, but not to each other. In face-to-face physical expression, parties express anger through bodily assault. In the physical expression that is not face-to-face, parties either destroy property or physically assault others who are not parties.

In order to start negotiations, parties must perceive that there is a conflict. To clarify this perception, at least one party should express anger to the other party. This anger should be tied to specific issues. Issues should be stated as concretely as possible, in terms of the specific incidents and the behaviors and conditions about which the parties are angry.

Anger should be expressed by each party verbally and face-to-face to the other party for several reasons: (1) to avoid the destructive consequences of indirect angry expression; (2) to give the other party the opportunity to express its own anger and state its own issues; (3) to provide each party an opportunity to assess the relative importance of all the issues stated; and (4) to express anger which, if left unexpressed, can impede one party from listening to the other party.

Step 2 is based on the definition and classification of issues described above, the concept of decentering, and democratic rights. Decentering is a theory developed by Inhelder and Piaget (1958) which refers to the cognitive ability of conflicting parties to view the conflicts from both their own and other parties' perspectives. Democratic rights are those rights set forth in the Bill of Rights. They include: dissent, procedural due process, substantive due process, equality, and privacy (Liljestrand, 1978).

In this step the parties should provide each other full descriptions of the conflict and the incidents, including time, place, parties present, and what was said and done. Exchanging descriptions may assist parties to clarify issues, gain perspective on the incidents, and note differences in perception of events and issues.

Each party should identify the democratic rights that were abridged by themselves and by the other party. This procedure provides a democratic framework within which negotiations can occur. By focusing on the rights rather than the motives of each party, the conflict has a better chance of being negotiated. In the process of identifying the abridged rights, the parties must also identify the individuals responsible for the abridgment. This process ensures that the right parties participate in the negotiation. Having each party identify their own rights that may have been abridged by the other party, and the other party's rights that may have been abridged by them, facilitates the process of decentering.

Whereas Step 1 is more emotional than cognitive, Step 2 is more cognitive than emotional. Carrying out both steps may assist the parties to integrate the feeling and thought generated by the conflict.

Step 3 is based on the concept of decentering and Deutsch's definition and classification of issues. To establish a common basis for negotiations, parties must be able to view the conflict from each other's perspectives and to agree on what the issues are. By using the classification of issues, the parties can distinguish more negotiable from less negotiable issues.

There are three beneficial consequences of taking the third step: (1) the number of issues is reduced to those incorporated in the statements prepared by the parties; (2) the parties recognize that, although they disagree, they may still be able to negotiate; and (3) it prevents issues from proliferating at later steps in the negotiation process.

Step 4 is based on the concepts of decentering and democratic rights. By decentering and by respecting each other's rights, the parties can bargain on the basis of each other's priorities of gains and losses. In this step each party proposes several alternative resolutions to the conflict that divide the gains and, if necessary, the losses. With the possibility of each party making gains, there is the likelihood that both parties will have an investment in resolving the conflict.

Step 5 requires that the parties develop a specific plan for implementing the agreement reached in Step 4. This plan should contain specific statements of who has particular responsibilities, when they are to be performed, and what action should be taken when one party fails to carry out its responsibilities. The procedure may avoid new conflicts arising from misunderstanding and forgetfulness.

Step 6 requires that parties develop a specific plan for evaluating the implementation. The plan should contain specific statements of who the evaluators are, the methods of evaluation, when it is to occur, and how the results are to be reported and used. In long-term agreements, it may be necessary to have periodic evaluations and revisions of the original compromise. This procedure provides the opportunity to negotiate issues left unresolved or to negotiate new issues.

Research on Negotiation

The model of negotiation described above is based on research on democratic rights, decentering, and the ways students hypothetically resolve school conflicts.

Democratic rights. De Cecco and Richards (1974) investigated students' understanding of the democratic rights involved in their own school conflicts. They identified four civil rights: participation in decision making, due process, equality, and dissent. Participation in decision making was defined as the right to have a voice in what rules should be made and how they should be enforced. Due process was defined as the right of a person who had been accused of something to have a fair chance to defend herself or himself. Equality was defined as the right to get the same chance in life no matter what your race, religion, or sex is, or how well off your parents are. Dissent was defined as the right to criticize, protest or refuse to take part in a group.

The original data were collected in 1969, through self-report questionnaires, from 6,783 students in more than 30 public and parochial urban and suburban junior and senior high schools in the New York City metropolitan area. The sample comprised an extensive mix of socio-economic status, race, nationality, religion, and school entrance requirements.

The questionnaire was a modification of the critical incident procedure developed by Flanagan (Flanagan & Schmid, 1959). The students were asked to describe incidents they had experienced or observed which left them or others with at least two alternative ways of acting and in which the "democratic thing to do" was not immediately clear. After describing the incidents students identified the civil right they believed had been abridged, using the list of four civil rights and definitions presented above. They were asked to rank the rights from one to four, assigning the rank of one to the right they believed had been most clearly abridged.

The findings indicated that students were able to identify the civil rights that were abridged in their school conflicts. The democratic right most frequently reported as abridged was decision making in both junior and senior high schools and in both urban and suburban areas.

Dissent was the right next most frequently abridged, followed respectively by equality and due process.

Decentering. De Cecco and Richards (1974) determined whether or not decentering was shown by students in their written descriptions of school conflict. If students used "I" in describing the first party, the description did not show decentering. Decentering ability was shown when students described the first party as "he," "she," "we," or "they," because these pronouns indicate that the students could take a point of view other than their own. In both first and second party descriptions, senior more than junior high school students showed decentering, a finding consistent with the cognitive developmental theory of Inhelder and Piaget (1958).

Ways students hypothetically resolve conflicts. Schaeffer (1975) investigated the differences in hypothesized resolutions students provided for the conflicts of others. The resolutions students suggested for their own conflicts were thought to reflect their actual performances in real conflict situations. Hypothetical resolutions to conflicts of others were considered to be related to ability to generate different types of resolutions. Students' emotional involvement in their own conflicts, it was believed, would reduce the number and types of resolutions they suggested for their own conflicts. Angry emotional involvement may blind one party to the conflict issues as viewed by the other party. Generating alternative resolutions may be facilitated when each party views the conflict from both its own and the other party's perspectives.

Schaeffer also compared hypothetical resolutions suggested by students in alternative schools with those suggested by students in traditional schools. Merelman (1971) stated that political thinking may be the sole function of politically related stimuli when such stimuli are intense, visible, and unequivocal. He believes that most political thinking in adolescence results from politically related environmental factors. Schaeffer assumed that the alternative school environment contains politically related environmental factors which are intense, visible, and unequivocal. Alternative schools presumably provide an environment conducive to sharing, group work, democratic teacher-student and student-student relationships, and a cooperative atmosphere. Students learn to work with others and have the opportunity to become aware of perspectives other than their own.

The results of Schaeffer's study were as follows: (1) The developmental component of decentering was supported in that the mean score of decentering for senior high students was significantly greater than that for junior high students in both alternative and traditional schools. (2) It was found that students who decentered more in describing conflicts also used more negotiation in suggesting conflict resolutions. (3) Results across the entire sample showed that scores in using negotiation in conflict resolution were higher for conflicts of others than for the resolutions suggested for their own conflicts. Apparently, emotional involvement in one's own conflicts may interfere with one's ability to generate alternative resolutions. (4) The results also indicated that students in alternative schools suggested a significantly greater use of negotiation in generating alternative resolutions to both their own conflicts and to conflicts of others than did students in traditional schools. It seems that the environment of the school may affect the use of negotiation by students in dealing with conflict.

Negotiation and Civic Education

Conflicts will frequently arise in democracy because of the diversity of needs and wants of individuals and groups and their participation in decision making. Negotiation provides the means for resolving conflict while protecting the rights and needs of individuals and groups. It would seem then that training in use of negotiation would be useful in preparing students for their future roles as citizens.

The negotiation model described in this paper can serve another purpose in a citizen education program. It can provide students with opportunities to learn three major components of citizen education: democratic rights (Liljestrand, 1978); cognitive and social skills (Hill, 1977); and attitudes (Hill, 1977). The relationship of rights, skills, and attitudes to each step of the negotiation model are described below.

Democratic rights. As stated earlier, Liljestrand and her associates (1978) have identified five democratic rights that are set forth in the Bill of Rights to the United States Constitution. These are: dissent, procedural due process, substantive due process, equality, and privacy.

The right of dissent is protected in Step 1 of the model by providing the opportunity for both parties to express anger over each other's actions. It is further protected in Step 2 by being tied to specific conditions and behavior that aroused anger.

The right of procedural due process is protected in the first three steps of the model. Steps 1 and 2 provide the opportunity for each party to hear and answer the charges of the other parties. Step 3 allows the parties to agree on which charges should be dealt with.

The right of substantive due process is protected in Steps 4 and 5 by providing essential gains for each party and assuring their delivery.

The right of equality is protected in each step of the model because each step allows both parties to participate equally in the resolution of the conflict.

The right of privacy is protected in Step 3 by the parties agreeing to the issues that are negotiable. Parties can refuse to negotiate issues, such as private sexual conduct, that endanger their right of privacy.

Cognitive and Social Skills. Inquiry skills (problem solving and decision making) are involved in the steps of negotiation. Problem solving skills are involved in Steps 1 through 4 of the model. In Steps 1 and 2, problems are explored and described as specific issues. In Step 3 the problems that will take the highest priorities for solution are selected. In Step 4 the options for solution are generated, evaluated and selected.

Decision-making skills are involved in Steps 3 through 6 of the model. In Step 3 the parties decide which issues should take the highest priorities. In Step 4 the parties decide on the particular gains and losses for each party. In Step 5 the parties must decide how to implement the agreement and on their respective responsibilities for implementation. In Step 6 the parties must decide the standards and conditions for evaluating the implementation.

Interpersonal skills are involved in all steps of the model. Communication skills, particularly speaking and listening by both parties, are utilized in each step. Skills in acting cooperatively are basic to the model since the parties must take each step together and reach mutually satisfying agreements. Leadership skills are involved when the parties present and defend their position in the conflict and invent solutions that are mutually acceptable. Action skills are involved when the parties have ongoing responsibility for resolving, not just complaining about, problems. Particular action skills--setting goals, planning strategies, considering consequences and evaluating courses of action--are centrally involved in the last two steps of negotiation.

Attitudes. Attitudes appropriate for citizens in a democracy are involved in the steps of negotiation. These attitudes have been identified as respect for others and commitment to equity, rationality, conscience and democratic rights. The model is related to these attitudes in two general ways: (1) the attitudes are prerequisite to the use of the model because they are the basis for the willingness to negotiate and (2) the explicit use of the negotiation model provides opportunities for students to develop these attitudes.

Training in Negotiation

As explained above, training in negotiation can be an important part of citizen education. However, very few teachers or students have an opportunity to learn how to negotiate. Teachers are not taught negotiating skills and techniques as part of their professional preparation. Students are not taught these skills at home or in school. This section of the paper, therefore, will suggest some ways in which training in a negotiation model of conflict resolution can be provided.

Training may be offered in high school or university courses, and in in-service workshops. Participants in courses and workshops should include teachers and students as well as school administrators and parents. It is important to include participants in each category, so that they can learn to negotiate conflicts that occur among them. The substance of the training should include the definition and identification of democratic rights, development of cognitive and social skills and democratic attitudes, and the resolution of real conflicts through use of the model of negotiation.

There are several reasons for using real conflicts as opposed to fictitious conflicts in the training. First, participants are more likely to become involved in and committed to the training when there is the prospect of successful resolution of their own ongoing conflicts. Second, the use of real conflicts discourages a common response to conflict--the avoidance of direct verbal expression of anger and attempts to cooperatively resolve the conflict. Negotiating real conflicts within the framework of training provides the technical assistance and the emotional support of the trainers and other members of the group in resolving what may be difficult conflicts.

Trainers can provide participants specific procedures to follow for the various steps of the negotiation model. For example, participants may benefit from writing out the specific substance of the particular step they are completing. In carrying out Step 1, the parties can describe in writing the incidents in the conflict, exchange copies of their reports, and read their own reports aloud in the presence of the other parties. This formal procedure structures the conflict and reduces the threat of angry expression. In Step 2, it may be helpful for the parties to examine the reports prepared in Step 1 for identifying issues as seen by either side.

The following procedures may facilitate completing Step 3. (1) Each party, from its own perspective, should state in writing the conflict issues. (2) Both parties should exchange these written statements. (3) Both parties, together, should determine areas of commonality or overlap in the issues. (4) Both parties, together, should record statements of issues to which they both agree. (5) These statements should be stated as questions and as specific conditions to be negotiated. The use of the question form presents the issues as problems to be solved. The reference to conditions leads to bargaining and the avoidance of win-lose resolutions.

The following procedures may be used for taking Step 4: (1) Using the common statement of issues, each party should list proposals for resolving the issues. The proposals should be as concrete as possible. (2) The possible gains and losses for each party should be identified for each proposal. (3) Each party should rank the proposals (its own and the other party's), assigning the first ranks to the most important gains (for the ranker). (4) Both parties should agree to inclusion and revision of statements of the original proposals. These last statements constitute the bargaining agreement.

When taking Steps 5 and 6, participants are taught how to plan the implementation of their agreements. They should be told to specify as concretely as possible who will do what and specify when and where it will be done. The evaluation program should include specification of who is to carry out the evaluation, when it is to be carried out, standards of acceptable performance of the implementation, and a description of what is to be done if the performance is found to be lacking or below standard. Both the implementation and evaluation plans should be signed by the parties to the conflict.

It is possible that training in negotiation can result in the institutionalizing of the negotiation process in the school. There are various forms of institutionalization--establishing grievance committees to hear teacher and student complaints, designating trained mediators to assist parties in using the model to resolve conflicts, and increasing the participation of students in the decision making of the school. Each of these forms might play an important role in a citizen education program.

REFERENCES

Coser, L. The functions of social conflict. Chicago: The Free Press, 1969.

De Cecco, J. P., & Richards, A. K. Growing pains: Uses of school conflict. New York: Aberdeen Press, 1974.

De Cecco, J. P., & Richards, A. K. Using negotiation for teaching civil liberties and avoiding liability, Phi Delta Kappan, 1975, 57 (1), 23-27.

De Cecco, J. P., & Richards, A. K. Can teachers use a workshop in conflict resolution?, National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1977, 61 (406), 70-75.

De Cecco, J. P., & Roberts, J. K. Negotiating school conflicts to prevent student delinquency. In E. Wenk, & N. Harlow, (Eds.) School crime and disruption: Prevention models. Davis, California: Responsible Action, Inc., 1977.

De Cecco, J. P., & Schaeffer, G. A. Using negotiation to resolve teacher-student conflicts. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1978, in press.

Deutsch, M. Conflicts: Productive and destructive. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 7-41.

Deutsch, M. The Resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1973.

Flanagan, J., & Schmid, F. W. The critical incident technique in psychopathology. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1959, 15, 136-139.

Friedman, J. Striving towards quality and equality in education. American Education, 1978, 2 (2), 17-19.

Hill, R. A. Working definition for citizen education. Philadelphia: Research For Better Schools, 1977.

Inhelder, B., & Piaget, J. The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence: An essay on the construction of formal operational structures. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Levi-Strauss, C. *The raw and the cooked: Introduction to a science of mythology*. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Liljestrand, P. The relationship of assumption and knowledge of the homosexual orientation to the abridgment of civil liberties. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 1978, *3* (3), 243-248.

Liljestrand, P. Conflict management. Bulletin of *Stride*, Far West Regional Laboratories, San Francisco, 1978, no. 7, pp. 5, 16.

Maslow, A. H. A theory of human motivation, *Psychological Review*, 1943, *50*, 370-396.

Maslow, A. H. Deficiency motivation and growth motivation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Vol. 3. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1955.

Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Merelman, R. M. The development of policy thinking in adolescence. *American Political Science Review*, 1971, *65* (4), 1033-1047.

Rubel, R. J. What the safe school study means to you. *American Educator*, 1978, *2*, 13-16.

Schaeffer, G. A. *The hypothetical use of negotiation in school conflicts by students in traditional and alternative high schools*. Master of arts thesis, San Francisco State University, 1975.

Schaeffer, G. A. Chicago teachers study stress. *American Educator*, 1978, *2* (2), 3.

7

SEEKING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE: A CONCLUSION

Barbara Z. Presseisen, Director
Citizen Education, Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Two questions were raised at the outset of this volume to give focus to the concerns of theory and practice in citizen education:

- How does the way in which a school is managed influence the concepts of authority, responsibility, rights, and freedoms as they are included in students' citizen education preparation?
- How does a classroom's organization or the design of the school's environment influence the perception of the "climate" of that institution and its citizen education program?

Research reviewed at RBS' May colloquium suggests that school is the most influential political socialization agent with respect to many issues of governance: rule compliance, attachment to symbols and institutions, and independence from partisan politics (Gillespie & Soley, p. 9). It is not the sole institution of influence, and, with regard to effects on attitudes and behavior formation, must share its role with both the community and the family. Nevertheless, school management without regard for individual rights and freedoms raises serious concerns for developing models of democratic practice (Grambs, p. 165). Some researchers maintain that the current situation in schools is in need of immediate modification, with extensive examination of who has real power in the classroom and what are the perceptions and realities of how that power is utilized.

Views of individual behavior and the study of institutional environments underline the holistic approach to understanding schools as complex social organizations. Elkind (p. 37) calls for the need to understand childrens' psychological growth and development as part of a totality of relationships. Gump (p. 57) has developed a theory of synomorphs, similar relationships and structures that permeate the whole organization of an institution and directly influence educational outcomes. Epstein (p. 153) suggests that an array of such alternative structures can be made available to classroom teachers along with research data on their likely consequences for students. A climate can be predicated in terms of the desired results of citizen education that instructors and administrators, as well as members of the community, want to achieve. Both individual growth and advancement of the institution as a whole can be served by such environments, which can maximize the effectiveness of the school's educational program.

The three areas of emphasis presented at the May colloquium suggested many new directions for citizen education from scholarly research, but not conclusive findings. Obviously, much more work needs to be pursued in each research area. Similarly, clear direction for practitioners is also lacking. Nelson (p. 97) points out that changes on the part of educators do not come easily or without expenditures of time and energy. In addition, he suggests, in a multicultural society such as America on the threshold of the twenty-first century, the needs of students in a population so diverse will require more ethnographic studies and extensive preparation of educators. In advocating a Piagetian or developmental approach, both Wyner (p. 102) and Gallagher (p. 136) emphasize a creative growth model of educational change and more direct experiences with the objects of learning in the students' own communities. More direct experiences for administrators might also be suggested. Finally, a rethinking of the curriculum and an end to fragmentation, as called for by French (p. 129), must accompany a fuller definition of citizen education to carry the concerns for governance and school climate beyond the narrow confines of a subject matter focus which is basic to other aspects of education but meaningless alone.

The examination of school governance and classroom climate as important issues of citizen education led to a number of recommendations by conference participants with regard to what practitioners and researchers could do in the immediate future. These recommendations included:

- Citizen education should have the support of the whole range of educational professionals, most particularly district administrators, principals, and teaching staff.
- It is probable that smaller schools are more conducive to citizenship behavior. However, citizen education in larger schools can and should be approached by fostering alternative "synomorphs" and by providing students with group identity within a school. It should also be recognized that students will have to cope with large

groups in adult life, even when their school experience has been in smaller institutions.

- Theoreticians and practitioners should develop a collegial relationship, not an antagonistic or cross-purposes attitude.
- Research should be carried out on the variables thought to be related to citizenship behavior, e.g., school size, role models, decision making, and participatory activity.
- A variety of "expressive" experiences should be part of students' citizen education, such as verbal interaction, creative dimensions, and role-model learning. Such experiences may be valuable ways to learn for all school personnel.
- Both the cognitive and affective domains are important to citizen education. They should not be fragmented in the school program. Basic skills are obvious requirements for a literate citizenry, too.
- "Learning by doing" (e.g., community internships) should be a goal of citizen education, despite the problem of variation in local resources and attitudes. Moreover, school itself should be viewed as a political and social entity that can serve as a laboratory in a community for developing the skills to deal with political and institutional processes.

- The developmental level of students should be a key consideration in all citizen education strategies. More research and testing in this area are needed.
- Citizen education should transcend the narrow social studies approach and embrace a multi-disciplinary, philosophical, and institutional perspective. Education for effective citizenship is not simply a curricular matter.
- Citizen education should develop the skills and knowledge for effective (as distinguished from "good") citizenship. It should deal with some aspects of the sense of empowerment.
- Citizen education should foster the awareness that concepts such as justice and equality should be based on a concern for the commonwealth, for everyone's welfare -- not on concern for one's own or one group's parochial and territorial preoccupations. Skills to develop this awareness can be taught. School personnel should be aware of similar concerns and skill building in the school or the district, each of which can be approached as a complex, social organization.

In addition, some community and public concerns were raised by the examination of school governance and classroom climate. There is a general consensus that accepts the importance of positive student relationships with the larger community and the significance of local support for the schools. A holistic or integrated approach was advocated. Resources of the community can enrich the citizen education program and provide a living laboratory for the participation and empowerment concerns of making democracy real to students. By the same token, a more meaningful exchange between community members, families, and school staff can enhance the educational environment of a community and win greater support for the school's program and practices. Such suggestions may become more meaningful in a period of high inflation accompanied by declining enrollment and an excess of schoolhouse space.

The key to the issues raised in the volume -- if one factor can be isolated or highlighted -- is involvement on the part of all the persons or groups who constitute the educational environment. To be involved in the decision making, the setting of policy, the selection of materials and practices, etc., is to be concerned, to have rights to be respected, to have responsibilities to achieve. Such involvement is the essence of democracy's schools.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF CONTRIBUTORS

JOSEPH J. D'AMICO is a Field Specialist in the Citizen Education component at Research for Better Schools and also Director of the Knowledge Interpretation Project for Citizenship Education. He holds a bachelor's degree in anthropology from the University of Pennsylvania, a masters degree in anthropology from Brandeis University, and a masters degree in education from the University of Pennsylvania. A specialist in school improvement processes and strategies, Mr. D'Amico has extensive experience in curriculum development and analysis, and in materials production and evaluation. His latest publication, issued by Research for Better Schools, is Words Into Action: A Classroom Guide to Children's Citizenship Education (1980).

JOHN DE CECCO received his M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania. He is presently professor of psychology at San Francisco State University and principal investigator of the federally-funded project on the abridgment of civil liberties and sexual orientation. He was principal investigator of the civic education project at Columbia University, 1968-1970.

LEE H. EHMAN is professor at the School of Education, Indiana University and chairman of the Department of Mathematics, Environment, Science, and Social Studies Education. Educated at the University of Michigan, Dr. Ehman comes to social studies education and political socialization with preparation in history, curriculum and instruction, and political science. He has taught at the secondary level and works with graduate and undergraduate students at Indiana. He has published extensively in books and journals; his most recent review of political socialization appeared in the Spring 1980 issue of the Review of Educational Research. Dr. Ehman is active in several national educational research and professional organizations. He has lectured in the United States and at several important international meetings.

DAVID ELKIND is professor and chairman, Eliot-Pearson Department of Child Study, Tufts University. He holds the Ph.D. degree in psychology from UCLA (1955). Formerly on the psychology faculty at the University of Rochester and the University of Denver, Dr. Elkind was also a post-doctoral fellow at the Austin Riggs Center and spent 1964-65 at Piaget's Centre D'epistemologie Genetique in Geneva. Dr. Elkind is noted for his Piagetian approach and for his research in areas of cognitive and perceptual development. His writings embrace research studies, review and theoretical articles, book chapters, books, and popular pieces (children's stories, general magazines). His is also consulting editor to many psychological journals; consultant to government agencies, state education departments, clinics, and mental health centers; and a much traveled lecturer.

JOYCE L. EPSTEIN is Research Scientist and Program Director at the Center for Social Organization of Schools and Assistant Professor of Social Relations at The Johns Hopkins University. She holds the Ph.D. in social relations (sociology) from Johns Hopkins (1974). Currently, Dr. Epstein is conducting research on the effects on students of alternative authority structures in schools and families, and research on the selection and influence processes in student peer groups. She contributes frequently to the literature and professional meetings.

GEORGE W. FRENCH is the Director of the Division of Social Studies in the School District of Philadelphia. He holds the Ed.D. in education from Temple University (1970). Dr. French has taught special education, social studies, and English in the School District of Philadelphia. He has also served as a junior high school vice-principal and an elementary school principal in Philadelphia. He is a member of the board of many community organizations and has served as a consultant for school districts, universities, publishers, state departments of education and other educational institutions and organizations.

JEANETTE M. GALLAGHER is Associate Professor of Educational Psychology (human development) at Temple University. She holds the Ph.D. degree in experimental psychology from Loyola University (Chicago)(1968), and has undertaken postdoctoral studies at the Center for Cognitive Studies, Harvard University. After teaching junior high school in Iowa, Dr. Gallagher joined the psychology department of Briar Cliff College in 1961, 3 years later moving to Loyola University as a National Science Foundation Fellow. Dr. Gallagher serves variously as consultant, editor, member, reviewer, and advisor to a number of educational associations and publishers. She has written research reports, journal articles, and books; presented many papers at professional meetings; and led workshops -- all centering largely on Piagetian theory and its application. Dr. Gallagher has also been awarded several research grants to investigate aspects of cognitive development.

JUDITH A. GILLESPIE is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Indiana University. She holds the Ph.D. degree in political science from the University of Minnesota (1979). Dr. Gillespie has held posts in several research projects dealing with political science and related curriculum issues, and has been a National Science Foundation Fellow at the University of Minnesota. She also currently serves as Director of the Seminar on Political Participation and Coordinator of the Midwest Conference on Early Adolescence. Active in professional groups, Dr. Gillespie is a leader in the National Council for the Social Studies and the Social Science Education Consortium. Her articles on citizen action and participation have appeared in many journals. She is an editor of several professional publications and the major author of a new textbook for secondary students in citizen education.

JEAN D. GRAMBS is Professor of Education at the University of Maryland. She holds the Ed.D. degree from Stanford University (1948). Dr. Grambs has taught high school in California and was on the faculty of Stanford University and George Washington University. For 3 years she was supervisor of adult education in Prince George's County (MD). She serves as consultant to many groups, directs or participates in a range of human-relations/intergroup workshops and institutes, and engages in diverse research studies in the areas of sex differences, sex equity, and aging. Finally, she serves on many organizational groups, particularly those of the National Council for the Social Studies. A prolific writer, Dr. Grambs' contribution to the professional literature is immense, covering a broad sweep of social, administrative, philosophical, psychological, and instructional issues.

PAUL V. GUMP is Professor of Psychology at the University of Kansas. He holds the Ph.D. degree in clinical psychology from the University of Colorado (1955). Starting his professional career as a social studies teacher in the public school systems of Ashland (Ohio), Vanport (Oregon), and San Francisco, Dr. Gump has also served as Project Director for several National Institute of Mental Health grants dealing with children's games and classroom discipline. Dr. Gump was associate professor of clinical and educational psychology at Wayne State University before joining the University of Kansas faculty in 1962. The author of many professional papers, he acts as consultant to a wide range of educational projects, foundations, and publications. Dr. Gump's major interest is ecological psychology, with a special emphasis on schools and other childhood environments.

PETRA LILJESTRAND received her M.A. in social psychology from San Francisco State University. She is presently a doctoral student in medical sociology at the University of California in San Francisco. She is also a research associate in the federally funded project on the abridgment of civil liberties and sexual orientation.

MURRY R. NELSON is Assistant Professor of Education at the Pennsylvania State University. He received the Ph.D. degree in curriculum and instruction from Stanford University (1975). Prior to his present position, Dr. Nelson taught elementary and junior high school social studies in the Chicago public schools and supervised teacher interns in Stanford (CA). He has written on issues dealing with social studies, justice education, and law-related education, while at the same time taking part in a variety of workshop, project, and conference programs related to these topics.

BARBARA Z. PRESSEISEN is Director of the Citizen Education component at Research for Better Schools. Her preparation includes work in history, curriculum development, and developmental psychology with degrees from Brandeis, Harvard, and Temple Universities. Dr. Presseisen has taught at Temple University and Swarthmore College and presented papers at various professional meetings. Her major interests are human development and social cognition and their applications in social studies and citizenship curricula. She serves as a consultant to several state departments of education. Her latest publication, issued by Research for Better Schools, is *Multicultural Education for Practitioners* (with Florence V. Davis, 1979).

NICHOLAS M. SANDERS is the Research Coordinator of the Citizen Education component at Research for Better Schools. His preparation includes work in philosophy and educational psychology with degrees from Antioch College and the University of Texas. Dr. Sanders has taught at the Pennsylvania State University and has been the main evaluator of several research projects at RBS. Dr. Sanders has a strong interest in the evaluation concerns of moral/ethical education. His latest publication, issued by Research for Better Schools, is *Obtaining Measures of Citizen Education Goals* (1979).

MARY SOLEY is Associate Director of the School Environmental Impact Program at the Program in Educational Policy and Change at Indiana University. A candidate for the doctoral degree at Indiana University, Ms. Soley has an extensive background in social studies education. In the April 1980 issue of *Social Education*, Ms. Soley was a major contributor to a special section on teaching about the current energy crisis.

NANCY B. WYNER is Assistant Professor at Wheelock College (Boston), where she teaches a variety of graduate and undergraduate courses. Dr. Wyner received the Ed.D. degree in curriculum and teaching from Teachers College, Columbia University (1974). She has held teaching and administrative posts in public and private schools and has been a consultant to projects (funded by both state and federal agencies) dealing chiefly with law education, citizenship, and multiethnic concerns. Dr. Wyner is currently project director of Toward Personhood and Participation, a citizenship education project for children at the Education Development Center, Newton, Massachusetts. She is a frequent contributor to the literature, a participant at many professional conferences, and the 1979-80 recipient of the Education Policy Fellowship, George Washington University.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Agger, R. E. & Goldstein, M. N. *Who will rule the schools?: A cultural class crisis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1971.

Allman-Snyder, A., May, M. J., & Garcia, F. C. Classroom structure and children's perceptions of authority: An open and closed case. *Urban Education*, 1975, *10*(2), 131-149.

Altman, I. & Wohlwill, J. F. (Eds.). *Human behavior and environment: Advances in theory and research. Volume 3: Children and the environment*. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.

Anderson, B. D. School bureaucratization and alienation from high school. *Sociology of Education*, 1973, *46*, 315-344.

Anderson, G. J. *The assessment of learning environments: A manual for the learning environment inventory and the my class inventory*. Halifax, N. S. Canada: Atlantic Institute of Education, 1973.

Anderson. G. J. *Effects of classroom social climate on individual learning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, February, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 045 530)

Armstrong, R. *Student involvement*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1972.

Baughman, J. E. *An investigation of the impact of civics on political attitudes of adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1975.

Boocock, S. S. The school as a social environment for learning: Social organization and micro-social process in education. *Sociology of Education*, 1973, *46*(Winter), 15-50.

Boonin, T. The benighted status of U. S. school corporal punishment practice. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1979, *61*(5), 395-396.

Borg, W. R., Bluhm, H., & Gibbons, N. C. *Student government as a vehicle for citizenship education*. Logan, UT: Bureau of Educational Research, Utah State University, 1966.

Borman, K. M. Overview: Patterns of classroom authority. *Education and Urban Society*, November 1978, *11*(1), 3-12.

Bowles, S. Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labor. In M. Carnoy (Ed.), *Schooling in a corporate society*. New York: David McKay, 1972.

Bradley, R. H. & Teeter, T. A. Perceptions of control over social outcomes and student behavior. *Psychology in the Schools*, 1977, *14*(2), 230-235.

Breckenridge, E. Improving school climate. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1976, *58*(4), 314-318.

Brookover, W. B. & Schneider, J. M. Academic environments and elementary school achievement. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1975, *9*(1), 82-91.

Brown, M. E. *Alienation and integration in the political attitudes of suburban adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.

Burbank, H. J. An empirical study of powerlessness among high school students. *High School Journal*, 1972, *55*(7), 343-354.

Burges, B. Rx for school governance. *Journal of Education*, 1977, *159*(1), 43-67.

California State Department of Education. *Improving the human environment of schools: Problems and strategies*. Sacramento, CA: Author, 1979.

Chesler, M., Crowfoot, J., & Bryant, B. I., Jr. Organization context of school discipline. *Education and Urban Society*, 1979, *11*(2), 496-510.

Clark, F. J. *Improving the school climate. Operations Notebook 19*. Sacramento, CA: Association of California School Administrators, October, 1977.

Clark, W. W., Jr. *Violence in the public schools: The problem and its solutions*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, March 27-31, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 151 990)

Cohen, E. G. *Sociology and the classroom: Setting the conditions for teacher-student interaction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 064 250)

Cooper, D. F. & Cooper, C. R. Classroom climate — assessing the highs and lows. *The Science Teacher*, February, 1976, 17-20.

Cortés, C. E. The societal curriculum and the school curriculum: Allies or antagonists? *Educational Leadership*, 1979, 36(7), 475-480.

Cuban, L. (Ed.). Discipline and American students. *Social Education*, 1978, *42*(2), 98-112.

DeNitto, J. F. & Gufford, J. L., Jr. Classroom management: A microcosm of good government. *The Clearing House*, 1979, *52*(6), 263-264.

Dole, J. W. *School discipline and racial conflict*. Harrisburg, PA: Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission, 1976.

Duke, D. L. *Can the curriculum contribute to calmer classrooms?* Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University, 1977.

Duke, D. L. How administrators view the crisis in school discipline. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1978, *59*(5), 325-330.

Duke, D. L. The etiology of student misbehavior and the depersonalization of blame. *Review of Educational Research*, 1978, *48*(3), 415-437.

Duke, D. L. Looking at the school as a rule-governed organization. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1978, *11*(4), 116-126.

Duke, D. L. (Ed.). Student behavior problems and school discipline (central theme of issue). *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 1978, *11*(4).

Duke, D. L., Donmoyer, R., & Farman, G. Emerging legal issues related to classroom management. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1978, 60(4), 305-309.

Ehman, L. H. The American school in the political socialization process. *Review of Educational Research*, 1980, 50(1), 99-120.

Ehman, L. H. *The function of the school in the political socialization process: American findings*. Paper prepared for the International Conference on Political Socialization and Political Education, Tutzing, West Germany, October 10-14, 1977.

Ehman, L. H. & Gillespie, J. A. *Political life in the hidden curriculum: Does it make a difference?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Chicago, November, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 255)

Elkind, D. *The child and society: Essays in applied child development*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Epstein, C. *Affective subjects in the classroom: Exploring race, sex, and drugs*. Scranton, PA: Intext Educational Publishers, 1972.

Epstein, C. *Classroom management and teaching: Persistent problems and rational solutions*. Reston, VA: Reston Publishing Co., 1979.

Epstein, J. L. *Friends in school: Patterns of selection and influence in secondary schools*. Report No. 266. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools, 1978.

Epstein, J. & McPartland, J. M. Authority structures. In Herbert J. Walberg (Ed.), *Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy, and productivity*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1979.

Erickson, F. Some approaches to inquiry in school-community ethnography. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 1977, *8*(2), 58-69.

Fenton, E. *Beyond the school curriculum: The school as a laboratory*. Speech delivered at The Pennsylvania Executive Academy, February 5-8, 1979.

Fowlkes, D. L. *The relative effects of the family, the school, peer groups, and the mass media on the political socialization of high school seniors in the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1974.

Fraser, B. J. Assessment of learning environment in elementary-school classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal*, 1979, *79*(5), 297-300.

Gillespie, J. A. & Ehman, L. H. *The school as a political system*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 15-19, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 093 785)

Gillespie, J. A., & Patrick, J. J. *Comparing political experiences.* Washington, D. C.: The American Political Science Association, 1974.

Giroux, H. A. Developing educational programs: Overcoming the hidden curriculum. *The Clearing House*, 1978, *52*(4).

Goldenson, D. An alternative view about the role of secondary school in political socialization. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 1978, *VI*(1), 44-72.

Grambs, J. D. Balancing power: The democratic classroom. In J. D. Grambs, J. C. Carr & R. Fitch (Eds.), *Modern methods in secondary education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Grambs, J. D. Do teachers really want democratic administrators? *Nation's Schools*, 1950, *46*(4).

Grambs, J. D. *Group processes and intergroup education*. New York: National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1955.

Grambs, J. D. *Schools, scholars, and society* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978.

Grambs, J. D. & Carr, John C. *Modern methods in secondary education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Grant, C. A. Classroom socialization: The other side of a two-way street. *Educational Leadership*, 1979, *36*(7), 470-474.

Grove, J., Remy, R., & Zeigler, L. H. The effects of political ideology and educational climates on student dissent. *American Politics Quarterly*, 1974, *2*(3), 259-275.

Gump, P. V. Ecological psychology and children. In M. Hetherington et al. (Eds.), *Review of Research in Child Development*, Vol. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Gump, P. V. School environments. In I. Altman & J. F. Wohlwill (Eds.), *Human behavior and environment: Advances in theory and research. Volume 3: Children and the environment*. New York: Plenum Press, 1978.

Hawley, W. D. *The implicit civics curriculum: Teacher behavior and political learning.* Durham, NC: Center for Policy Analysis, Duke University, 1976.

Henning, J. F. Student rights and responsibilities and the curriculum. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1974, *56*(4), 248-250; 256.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. & Sharan, S. Self-esteem, locus of control, and children's perception of classroom climate: A developmental perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 1979, *4*(2), 154-169.

Heyman, M. *Places and spaces: Environmental psychology in education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1978.

Hill, J. P. *Secondary schools, socialization, and social development during adolescence*. Paper prepared for the National Institute of Education, June, 1978. Omaha: Center for the Study of Youth Development, Boy's Town.

Horacek, T. The discipline dilemma. *Today's Education*, 1979, *68*(2), 20-21.

Howard, E. R. *School discipline desk book*. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Co., 1978.

Howard, N. K. *Discipline and behavior: An abstract bibliography*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 092 243)

Hoy, W. *An investigation of the relationship between characteristics of secondary schools and student alienation*. Final report on Project #9, B160 to U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, January, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 046 060)

Iannaccone, L. *Politics in education*. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1967.

Iannaccone, L., & Lutz, F. *Politics, power, and policy: The governing of local school districts*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill, 1970.

Jackson, P. *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1978.

Jaros, D., & Canon, B. C. Transmitting basic political values: The role of the educational system. *The School Review*, 1969, *77*, 94-107.

Jayatilleke, R. *Human relations in the classroom. An annotated bibliography: Supplement 2*. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on the Urban Disadvantaged, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 079 437)

Jennings, M. K. An aggregate analysis of home and school effects on political socialization. *Social Science Quarterly*, 1974, *55*(2), 394-410.

Jennings, M. K., & Niemi, R. Patterns of political learning. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1968, *38*(3), 443-467.

Jennings, M. K., Ehman, L. H., & Niemi, R. G. Social studies teachers and their pupils. In M. K. Jennings & R. G. Neimi (Eds.), *The political character of adolescence: The influence of families and schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Jones, R. S. Changing student attitudes: The impact of community participation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 1974, *55*(2), 439-450.

Jones, R. S. Student political involvement and attitude change. *Teaching Political Science*, 1975, *2*(3), 256-274.

Kafner, F. H. Personal control, social control, and altruism: Can society survive the age of individualism? *American Psychologist*, 1979, *34*(3), 231-239.

Kerchner, C. T. The impact of collective bargaining on school governance. *Education and Urban Society*, 1979, *11*(2), 181-207.

Kindsvatter, R. A new view of the dynamics of discipline. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1978, *59*(5), 322-325.

Kounin, J. S. & Sherman, L. W. School environments as behavior settings. *Theory Into Practice*, 1979, *18*(3), 145-151.

Langton, K. P. *Political socialization*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Lawrenz, F. The stability of student perception of the classroom learning environment. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 1977, *14*(1), 77-81.

Levin, M. L. *The political socialization of adolescents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1967.

Ligon, J. How to run a needs meeting. *The Clearing House*, 1979, *52*(7), 336-339.

Litt, E. Civic education, community norms, and political indoctrination. *American Sociological Review*, 1963, *28*(1), 69-75.

Long, J. D. & Frye, V. H. *Making it till Friday: A guide to successful classroom management*.

Mallory, R. M. The teacher who disciplines LEAST. *Today's Education*, 1979, *68*(2), 23-26.

Martin, J. R. What should we do with a hidden curriculum when we find one? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 1976, *6*(2), 135-151.

Massialas, B. G. (Ed.). *Political youth, traditional schools: National and international perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

McDermott, R. P. Social relations as contexts for learning in schools. *Harvard Educational Review*, 1977, *47*(2), 198-213.

McPartland, J. M. & McDill, E. L. *High school rules & decision-making procedures as sources of school stability* (A report). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 091 870)

McPartland, J., McDill, E., Lacey, C., Harris, R., & Novey, L. Student participation in high school decisions: A study of students and teachers in fourteen urban high schools. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, 1971.

Meihofer, S. S. (Ed.). The student and the learning environment. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1974.

Merelman, R. M. Political socialization and education climates. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971.

Milofsky, C. Rising school disruption: A false alarm? School Review, 1978, 87(1), 64-71.

Mizell, M. H. Improving school disciplinary practices. Education and Urban Society, 1979, 11(4), 547-566.

Moos, R. H. Evaluating educational environments: Procedures, measures, findings, and policy implications. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1979.

Morgan, S. R. Shared governance in the Salt Lake City schools. Salt Lake City, UT: Salt Lake City Schools, Research and Public Information, 1979.

National School Public Relations Association. Discipline crisis in schools: The problem, causes and search for solutions. Arlington, VA: Author, 1973.

Ornstein, A. C. On high school violence: The student-teacher role. Journal of Secondary Education, 1970, 45(3), 99-105.

Overly, N. V. (Ed.). The unstudied curriculum: Its impact on children. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970.

Owens, R. G. Organizational behavior in schools. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Patrick, J. J. The impact of an experimental course "American political behavior" on the knowledge, skills and attitudes of secondary school students. Social Education, 1972, 36, 168-179.

Peretti, P. O. Effects of teachers' attitudes on discipline problems in school recently desegregated. Education, 1976, 97(2), 136-140.

Phay, R. E. Written student conduct codes: An essential ingredient in reducing and controlling student misconduct. Statement before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, September 17, 1975.

Phi Delta Kappa. School climate improvement: A challenge to the school administrator. An occasional paper. Bloomington, IN: Author, 1974.

Phi Delta Kappan. January, 1978, 59(5). The problems of discipline and violence in American education. (Central theme of issue.)

Ponder, G. A., & Button, C. B. Student classroom initiations and political attitudes: Relationships between behavior and attitudes. Contemporary Education, 1975, 46(3), 221-228.

Renshon, S. A. (Ed.). Handbook of political socialization: Theory and research. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Richards, A. K., & DeCecco, J. P. A study of student perceptions of civic education. Journal of Social Issues, 1975, 31(2), 111-122.

Rist, R. C. The milieu of a ghetto school as a precipitator of educational failure. Phylon, 1972, 33(4), 348-360.

Rist, R. C. On the social and cultural milieu of an urban black school: An ethnographic case study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Sociology of Education Panel of the Pacific Sociological Association, Portland, Oregon, April, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 066 523)

Rivers, W. The disruptive student and the teacher. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1977.

Roberts, D. A. Changing patterns of school governance. Boston: National Association of Independent Schools, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 098 668)

Rosenbaum, J. E. The structure of opportunity in school. Social Forces, 1978, 57(1), 236-281.

Schneider, J. M., Glasheen, J. D. & Hadley, D. W. Secondary school participation, institutional socialization, and student achievement. Urban Education, 1979, 14(3), 285-302.

Sebert, S. K., Jennings, M. K., & Neimi, R. G. The political texture of peer groups. In M. K. Jennings and R. G. Niemi (Eds.), The political character of adolescence. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Shaheen, T. A. & Redrick, W. R. *School district climate improvement: A challenge to the school superintendent*. Denver, CO: CFK Ltd., 1974.

Sigel, R. Students' comprehension of democracy and its application to conflict situations. *International Journal of Political Education*, 1979, *2*(1), 47-65.

Spindler, G. (Ed.). *Case studies in education and cultures* (16 vols.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968-1973.

Staub, E. *Positive social behavior and morality. Volume 2: Socialization and development.* New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1979.

Stern, V. *The school environment inventory*. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 102 139)

Stokols, D. (Ed.). *Perspectives on environment and behavior*. New York: Plenum Publishing Corp., 1977.

Strauss, G. H. School as power structure: Student attitudes toward high school policies, student power position, and student rights movement. *Education and Urban Society*, 1974, *7*, 3-27.

Struzziery, J. M. School climate and racial attitudes. *Integrated Education*, 1977, *15*(6), 100-102.

Sullivan, J. L., Pierson, J. E. & Marcus, G. E. Political intolerance: The illusion of progress. *Psychology Today*, 1979, *12*(9), 87-91.

Tanner, L. N. *Classroom discipline for effective teaching and learning*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1978.

Tanner, L. N. A model of school discipline. *Teachers College Record*, 1979, *80*(4), 734-742.

Tapp, J. L., & Kohlberg, L. Developing senses of law and legal justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1971, *27*(2), 65-92.

Torney, J. V. *An optimistic view of the importance of research for social studies education*. Speech delivered at the National Council for the Social Studies, Houston, Texas, November, 1978, as a recipient of 1977 Citation for Exemplary Research.

Torney, J. V., & Hess, R. B. *Teachers, students and political attitude development*. Unpublished paper, November, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 042 661)

Tye, K. A. *School climate and the development of a global perspective*. New York: Center for Global Perspectives, 1976.

Unruh, A. Teachers and classroom discipline. *NASSP Bulletin*, 1977, *61*(406), 84-87.

Walberg, H. J. (Ed.). *Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy and productivity*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1979.

Weinstein, C. S. The physical environment of the school: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 1979, *49*(4), 577-610.

Weissburg, R. Adolescent experiences with political authorities. *Journal of Politics*, 1972, *34*(3-4), 797-824.

Weissburg, R. *Political learning, political choice and democratic citizenship*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Welker, W. A. Discipline -- A reality of teaching. *Education*, 1976, *96*(3), 238-239.

Westbury, I. & Abrahamson, J. H. *Theory and phenomena in curriculum research: The classroom as a test case*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 643)

Williams, J. W. Discipline in the public schools: A problem of perception? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1979, *60*(5), 385-387.

Wittes, [illegible]. *Innovative governance in secondary schools*. Ann Arbor, MI: Educational Change Team, 1972.

Wittmer, J. & Loesch, L. A study of teacher-principal relationships. *Humanist Educator*, December, 1976.

Wyner, N. B. *The Cambridge study: Involving citizens in defining citizenship education for children (working draft)*. Unpublished manuscript, U. S. Office of Education, n. d.

Wyner, N. B. *Social and political thinking in children: Implications for law-related education*. Paper prepared for the Youth Education for Citizenship Committee, American Bar Association, for A Symposium on Law and the Humanities, May, 1978.

Wynne, E. A. Schools and socialization. *Educational Leadership*, 1979, *36*(7), 464-469.

Zeigler, H. L., & Jennings, M. K. *Governing American schools*. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, 1974.